arXiv:1702.03807v1 [math.MG] 31 Jan 2017

A General Framework for tilings, Delone sets, functions and measures, and their interrelation

Yasushi Nagai[1]

[1]Keio Univ., 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa 223-8522, Japan.
(e-mail: nagai@math.keio.ac.jp)

February 14, 2017

Abstract

We define a general framework that includes objects such as tilings, Delone sets, functions and measures, as a first step to discuss their almost periodicity in a systematic way. We define local derivability and mutual local derivability (MLD) between any two of these objects in order to describe their interrelations. We show several canonical maps in aperiodic order send an object $\mathcal{P}$ to a one that is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$. Moreover we show that, for an object $\mathcal{P}$ and a class Σ of objects, a mild condition on them assures that there is $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma$ that is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$. As an application, we study pattern equivariant functions.

1 Introduction

Symmetries of tilings have been analyzed since a long time ago. Here, a tiling is a collection of tiles in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such as polygons that intersect only on their boundaries and cover the space $\mathbb{R}^d$. For example, set $d = 2$ and take a square I with side-length 1. The collection $\mathcal{T} = \{I + x \mid x \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ forms a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^2$. This is crystallographic: there is a basis $\{e_1, e_2\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that the shifts by such vectors coincide with the original tiling, that is, $\mathcal{T}+e_i = \mathcal{T}$ for $i = 1, 2$. In addition to translations, the tiling $\mathcal{T}$ has symmetry by rotations and flips. The symmetry group of $\mathcal{T}$ consists of translations, $n\pi/2$-rotations, where $n = 1, 2, 3$, flips, and their compositions. It has been known since a long time ago that there are only 17 isomorphic classes of symmetry groups of crystallographic tilings. Hilbert's 18th problem asked if there are only finitely many such groups in a general dimension. Bieberbach answered this problem affirmatively (see for example [8], Theorem 7.5.3).

In 1970s Penrose found interesting tilings, which we call Penrose tilings. Any Penrose tiling $\mathcal{T}_P$ is not periodic, that is, if $\mathcal{T}_P + x = \mathcal{T}_P$, then $x = 0$. However, $\mathcal{T}_P$ is "almost

periodic": for example, every finite pattern that appears in $\mathcal{T}_P$ repeats with bounded gaps. We call tilings with this property repetitive tilings.

On the other hand, around 1920 Bohr found an interesting class of functions on $\mathbb{R}$. We call the functions in this class Bohr almost periodic functions. They are not necessarily periodic: for such a function f, there may be no nonzero vector $t \in \mathbb{R}$ for which the shift ${}_tf$ (${}_tf(s) = f(s-t)$) coincides with f. However, like repetitive tilings given above, they exhibit another form of almost periodicity, in the sense that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the set $\{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \|f - {}_tf\| < \varepsilon\}$ has bounded gaps in $\mathbb{R}$. Here, $\|\cdot\|$ is the sup-norm.

Moreover, certain subsets (Delone sets) of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and certain measures on $\mathbb{R}^d$ are known to have a form of almost periodicity.

Such almost periodicity plays an important role in aperiodic order, a branch of mathematics which studies non-periodic objects that are "close" to periodic. First, the repetitivity of a certain (FLC and finite tile type) tiling is equivalent to the minimality of the corresponding tiling dynamical system ([1], Proposition 5.4). Here, tiling dynamical systems are geometric analogues for symbolic dynamical systems and are important by themselves. Second, Gouéré ([4]) proved that, for certain Delone sets, having a type of almost periodicity is equivalent to being pure point diffractive. Here, being pure point diffractive is important with connection to the study of quasicrystals. As to the relations between almost periodicity and pure point diffraction, [10] and [2] are also important. Third, for certain weighted Dirac combs, having another type of almost periodicity is equivalent to having higher-dimensional periodic structure behind them, that is, such a measure is constructed from a cut and project scheme ([11], Theorem 5.1).

In the context above it is natural to try to understand almost periodicity. A classification of almost periodic structures is an ultimate goal. For example, one can ask whether there are only finitely many almost periodic structures if we fix a type of almost periodicity that we try to investigate. One can also investigate the relations of almost periodicities between two different objects. To this objective, we should *define* almost periodic structure and study several classes of almost periodic structures and their interrelations in a systematic way.

In this article, we give a general framework to discuss almost periodic objects such as tilings, functions, Delone sets and measures in a systematic way and study their interrelation, as a first step to discuss their almost periodicity in a unified manner. In particular, in Section 2, we define "pattern space" and show the spaces of these objects such as tilings are captured in this framework. As to the interrelation of these objects, we define in Section 3 pattern spaces with a group action and local derivability. Local derivability and mutual local derivability were first defined by Baake, Schlottmann and Jarvis ([3]) for patterns and have been used in aperiodic order throughout. With this concept we can describe "similarities" between two tilings: for example, a Penrose tilings by two rhombi is mutually locally derivable (MLD) with a Penrose tiling by kites and darts; two tilings which are MLD are considered to be "similar" and the distributions of patches in the two tilings are the same. We generalize this concept and define local derivability and mutual local

derivability between two objects such as tilings, Delone sets, functions and measures.

We answer the following two questions:

1. There are several canonical maps, such as

   (a) the map that sends a Delone set D in a proper metric space X to a positive measure $\sum_{x \in D} \delta_x$, where δ_x is the Dirac measure at a point x,

   (b) the map that sends a continuous bounded function f on a locally compact abelian group G to a measure $f d\mu$, where μ is a Haar measure,

   and so on. Do these maps send an object $\mathcal{P}$ to a one that is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$?

2. For an object $\mathcal{P}$ and an interesting class Σ of objects, can we describe a condition on $\mathcal{P}$ and Σ that assures that there is $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma$ which is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$?

We solve the first question affirmatively: see Proposition 3.21, Proposition 3.22, and Proposition 3.28. These show our generalized MLD is a natural concept. As to the second question, see Theorem 4.1. There we describe a condition on $\mathcal{P}$ and a one on Σ (not on the relations between $\mathcal{P}$ and Σ) that assures that there is a $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma$ which is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$. The conditions are mild enough so that many interesting examples satisfy them. Theorem 4.1 enables us to "translate" an object $\mathcal{P}$ to an object $\mathcal{Q}$ in another class Σ of objects so that we can use tools that can be applicable only to objects in Σ. For example, for FLC tilings there is a theory of deformation [9]; for functions and certain measures we have Fourier analysis; for objects from cut and project scheme we have higher-dimensional periodic structures; each class has useful tools, and by Theorem 4.1 we can move among these classes and use these tools to study objects such as tilings, Delone sets, functions and so on.

As an application, in Section 5 we study pattern equivariant functions, which were defined by Kellendonk [6] and generalized by Rand [7]. We first show that pattern equivariant functions for an object $\mathcal{P}$ are the functions that are locally derivable from $\mathcal{P}$. In other words, we can capture pattern equivariant functions in terms of local derivability and this simplifies the study of pattern equivariant functions. Next, we show that two objects $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are MLD if and only if the spaces of the pattern-equivariant functions are the same, under a mild condition. The space of pattern equivariant functions has all the information of the original object up to MLD; in order to analyze certain objects up to MLD, it suffices to investigate its space of pattern equivariant functions.

The framework of pattern space enables us to capture the repetitivity of objects such as tilings, Delone sets, functions and measures as a type of almost periodicity. (An object $\mathcal{P}$ is repetitive if the set of group elements γ such that $\mathcal{P}$ and $\gamma^{-1}\mathcal{P}$ are "close" with respect to a local topology is relatively dense.) Although this framework may not capture other types of almost periodicity and we need an additional structure in order to capture them, the definition of the above framework is the first step.

Notation 1.1. For a metric space X, the *closed* ball with its center $x \in X$ and its radius $r > 0$ is denoted by $B(x, r)$.

For a positive integer d, let ρ be the Euclidean metric for the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\mathrm{E}(d)$ be the group of all isometries on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathrm{O}(d)$ be the orthogonal group. There is a group isomorphism $\mathbb{R}^d \rtimes \mathrm{O}(d) \to \mathrm{E}(d)$, by which we can identify these two groups. Thus elements of $\mathrm{E}(d)$ are recognized as pairs (a, A) of $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \in \mathrm{O}(d)$. For $\mathrm{E}(d)$, define a metric $\rho_{\mathrm{E}(d)}$ by $\rho_{\mathrm{E}(d)}((a, A), (b, B)) = \rho(a, b) + \|A - B\|$, where $\| \cdot \|$ is the operator norm for the operators on the Banach space $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the Euclidean norm. For any closed subgroup Γ of $\mathrm{E}(d)$, the restriction ρ_Γ of $\rho_{\mathrm{E}(d)}$is a left-invariant metric for Γ. Moreover, for any $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$, we have

$$\rho(\gamma 0, \eta 0) \leqq \rho_\Gamma(\gamma, \eta) \leqq \rho(\gamma 0, \eta 0) + 2. \tag{1}$$

For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, let $e_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the vector of which ith component is 0 for $i \neq j$ and jth component is 1.

We set $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$.

For any group Γ which acts on a set X, its isotropy group for a point $x \in X$ is denoted by Γ_x. That is, $\Gamma_x = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma x = x\}$. The identity element of any group is denoted by e. If $\mathcal{P}$ is an object such as a patch, a function, a measure or a subset of X, its group of symmetry is by definition $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{P} = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}\}$ (a special case of isotropy groups).

2 General theory of pattern spaces

In this section X represents a nonempty topological space unless otherwise stated. First, in Subsection 2.1, we define "pattern space". Several spaces such as the space of patches and the space of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$ have an operation of "cutting off": for example, for a discrete set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and a subset C of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we can "cut off" D by the window C by taking intersection $D \cap C$. We axiomatize the properties that such cutting-off operation should have and obtain the notion of pattern space. Several spaces of objects such as patches, subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, functions and measures are captured in this framework. In Subsection 2.2 we introduce an order relation on a pattern space, which is the inclusion between two patches when the pattern space is the set of all patches. In Subsection 2.3 we study the operation of "gluing" objects to obtain a new object. This is an abstract framework to capture the usual operation of taking union. Finally, in Subsection 2.4 we define zero elements, which is the empty-set in the pattern space of all patches and is zero function in the pattern space of all functions.

2.1 Definition and examples of pattern space

Definition 2.1. The set of all closed subsets of X is denoted by $\mathcal{C}(X)$.

Definition 2.2. A non-empty set Π equipped with a map

$$\Pi \times \mathcal{C}(X) \ni (\mathcal{P}, C) \mapsto \mathcal{P} \cap C \in \Pi \tag{2}$$

such that

1. $(\mathcal{P} \cap C_1) \cap C_2 = \mathcal{P} \cap (C_1 \cap C_2)$ for any $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ and any $C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, and
2. for any $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ there exists $C_{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ such that

$$\mathcal{P} \cap C = \mathcal{P} \iff C \supset C_{\mathcal{P}},$$

for any $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$,

is called a pattern space over X. The map (2) is called the scissors operation of the pattern space Π. The closed set $C_{\mathcal{P}}$ that appears in 2. is unique. It is called the support of $\mathcal{P}$ and is represented by $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}$. Elements in Π are called abstract patterns in Π.

Remark 2.3. Note that the symbol $\cap$ is used for two different meanings: sometimes it refers to the scissors operation given to a pattern space; sometimes it refers to the intersection of two subsets of X.

Lemma 2.4. *Let Π be a pattern space over X. For any $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, we have* $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap C) \subset (\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}) \cap C$.

Proof.

$$(\mathcal{P} \cap C) \cap ((\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}) \cap C) = (\mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}) \cap C = \mathcal{P} \cap C.$$

□

Example 2.5 (The space of patches in a metric space)**.** Let X be a metric space. An open, nonempty and bounded subset of X is called a tile (in X). A set $\mathcal{P}$ of tiles such that if $S, T \in \mathcal{P}$, then either $S = T$ or $S \cap T = \emptyset$ is called a patch (in X). The set of all patches in X is denoted by $\operatorname{Patch}(X)$. For $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Patch}(X)$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, set

$$\mathcal{P} \cap C = \{T \in \mathcal{P} \mid T \subset C\}.$$

With this scissors operation $\operatorname{Patch}(X)$ becomes a pattern space over X. For $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Patch}(X)$, its support is

$$\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \overline{\bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{P}} T}.$$

Patches $\mathcal{P}$ with $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = X$ are called tilings.

Example 2.6 (The space of all locally finite subsets of a metric space)**.** Let X be a metric space. Let $\mathrm{LF}(X)$ be the set of all locally finite subsets of X; that is,

$$\mathrm{LF}(X) = \{D \subset X \mid \text{for all } x \in X \text{ and } r > 0,\ D \cap B(x, r) \text{ is finite}\}.$$

With the usual intersection $\mathrm{LF}(X) \times \mathcal{C}(X) \ni (D, C) \mapsto D \cap C \in \mathrm{LF}(X)$ of two subsets of X, $\mathrm{LF}(X)$ is a pattern space over X. For any $D \in \mathrm{LF}(X)$, its support is D itself.

Example 2.7 (The space of all uniformly discrete subsets)**.** We say, for $r > 0$, a subset D of a metric space (X, ρ) is r-uniformly discrete if $\rho(x, y) > r$ for any $x, y \in D$ with $x \neq y$. The set $\mathrm{UD}_r(X)$ of all r-uniformly discrete subsets of X is a pattern space over X by the usual intersection as a scissors operation. If D is r-uniformly discrete for some $r > 0$, we say D is uniformly discrete. The set $\mathrm{UD}(X) = \bigcup_{r>0} \mathrm{UD}_r(X)$ of all uniformly discrete subsets of X is also a pattern space over X.

Example 2.8. With the usual intersection of two subsets of X as a scissors operation, the set 2^X of all subsets of X and $\mathcal{C}(X)$ are pattern spaces over X.

Example 2.9 (The space of maps)**.** Let Y be a nonempty set. Take one element $y_0 \in Y$ and fix it. The pattern space $\mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ is defined as follows: as a set the space is equal to $\mathrm{Map}(X, Y)$ of all mappings from X to Y; for $f \in \mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, the scissors operation is defined by

$$(f \cap C)(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C \\ y_0 & \text{if } x \notin C. \end{cases}$$

With this operation $\mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ is a pattern space over X and for $f \in \mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ its support is $\operatorname{supp} f = \overline{\{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq y_0\}}$.

Example 2.10 (The space of measures)**.** Let X be a locally compact σ-compact metric space. Let $C_c(X)$ be the space of all continuous and complex-valued functions on X which have compact supports. Its dual space $C_c(X)^*$ with respect to a suitable topology consists of Radon charges, that is, the maps $\Phi\colon C_c(X) \to \mathbb{C}$ such that there is a unique positive Borel measure m and a Borel measurable map $u\colon X \to \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\Phi(\varphi) = \int_X \varphi u dm$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c(X)$. For such Φ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ set

$$(\Phi \cap C)(\varphi) = \int_C \varphi u dm$$

for each $\varphi \in C_c(X)$. Then the new functional $\Phi \cap C$ is a Radon charge. With this operation $C_c(X)^* \times \mathcal{C}(X) \ni (\Phi, C) \mapsto \Phi \cap C \in C_c(X)^*$, the space $C_c(X)^*$ becomes a pattern space over X.

Note that if m is a positive measure on X and $u\colon X \to \mathbb{C}$ is a bounded Borel map (not necessarily $\mathbb{T}$-valued), then $\Phi\colon C_c(X) \ni \varphi \mapsto \int \varphi u dm$ is a Radon charge. If $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then

$$(\Phi \cap C)(\varphi) = \int_C \varphi u dm,$$

for each $\varphi \in C_c(X)$.

Next we investigate pattern subspaces. The relation between a pattern space and its pattern subspace is similar to the one between a dynamical system and its invariant subspace.

Definition 2.11. Let Π be a pattern space over X. Suppose a non-empty subset Π' of Π satisfies the condition

$$\mathcal{P} \in \Pi' \text{ and } C \in \mathcal{C}(X) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P} \cap C \in \Pi'.$$

Then Π' is called a pattern subspace of $\mathcal{P}$.

Remark 2.12. If Π' is a pattern subspace of a pattern space Π, then Π' is a pattern space by restricting the scissors operation.

Example 2.13. Let X be a topological space. Then $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is a pattern subspace of 2^X. If X is a metric space, then $\mathrm{LF}(X)$ is a pattern subspace of $\mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\mathrm{UD}_r(X)$ is a pattern subspace of $\mathrm{UD}(X)$ for each $r > 0$. If moreover the closed balls are compact, $\mathrm{UD}(X)$ is a pattern subspace of $\mathrm{LF}(X)$.

Next we investigate two ways to construct new pattern spaces from old ones; taking product and taking power set.

Lemma 2.14. *Let Λ be an index set and $\Pi_\lambda, \lambda \in \Lambda$, is a family of pattern spaces over X. The direct product $\prod_\lambda \Pi_\lambda$ becomes a pattern space over X by a scissors operation*

$$(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda} \cap C = (\mathcal{P}_\lambda \cap C)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}.$$

for $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda \in \prod_\lambda \Pi_\lambda$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. The support is given by $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda = \overline{\bigcup_\lambda \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}_\lambda}$.

Definition 2.15. Under the same condition as in Lemma 2.14, we call $\prod \Pi_\lambda$ the product pattern space of $(\Pi_\lambda)_\lambda$.

Lemma 2.16. *Let Π be a pattern space over X. The set 2^Π of all subsets of Π is a pattern space over X by a scissors operation*

$$\Xi \cap C = \{\mathcal{P} \cap C \mid \mathcal{P} \in \Xi\}, \tag{3}$$

for any $\Xi \in 2^\Pi$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. The support is given by $\operatorname{supp} \Xi = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}}$.

Definition 2.17. The power set 2^{Π} of a pattern space Π, endowed with the scissors operation in equation (3), is called the power pattern space of Π.

Next, we define a notion which will be useful later. Maps and elements of 2^X (and so uniformly discrete subsets of X) always satisfy this condition; a patch (and so a tiling) satisfies this condition if and only if the diameters of tiles in that patch are bounded from above.

Definition 2.18. Let Π be a pattern space over a metric space X. For any element $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$, we say $\mathcal{P}$ consists of bounded components if there is $R_{\mathcal{P}} > 0$ such that for any $x \in \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}$, we have $x \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_{\mathcal{P}}))$.

2.2 An order on pattern spaces

Definition 2.19. Let Π be a pattern space over X. We define a relation $\geqq$ on Π as follows: for each $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$, we set $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$ if

$$\mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}.$$

Lemma 2.20. *1. If $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$, then $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \supset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$.*

2. The relation $\geqq$ is an order on Π.

Proof. If $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$, then

$$\mathcal{Q} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}.$$

Thus $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \supset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$. Next we prove that $\geqq$ is an order. $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{P}$ is clear. If $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \geqq \mathcal{P}$, then $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}$. Finally, if $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q} \geqq \mathcal{R}$, then $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \supset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} \supset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{Q} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}$, and so $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{R}$. □

Lemma 2.21. *1. If $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{P} \cap C$.*

2. If $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$, $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$, then $\mathcal{P} \cap C \geqq \mathcal{Q} \cap C$.

Proof. The statements follow from Lemma 2.4.

1. $\mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap C) = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \cap C \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap C) = \mathcal{P} \cap C \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap C) = \mathcal{P} \cap C$.
2. $\mathcal{P} \cap C \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{Q} \cap C) = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} \cap C \cap \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{Q} \cap C) = \mathcal{Q} \cap C$. □

Definition 2.22. Let Ξ be a subset of Π. If the supremum of Ξ with respect to the order $\geqq$ defined in Definition 2.19 exists in Π, it is denoted by $\bigvee \Xi$.

Lemma 2.23. *If a subset $\Xi \subset \Pi$ admits the supremum $\bigvee \Xi$, then* $\operatorname{supp} \bigvee \Xi = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \Xi} \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}}$.

Proof. Set $C = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}}$. Since $\bigvee\Xi \geqq \mathcal{P}$ for any $\mathcal{P} \in \Xi$, by Lemma 2.21 $\operatorname{supp}\bigvee\Xi \supset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}$ for each $\mathcal{P} \in \Xi$. Since the support is closed, we have $\operatorname{supp}\bigvee\Xi \supset C$. If $\operatorname{supp}\bigvee\Xi$ is strictly larger than C we have the following contradiction. Since $(\operatorname{supp}\bigvee\Xi)\cap C \subset C \neq \operatorname{supp}\bigvee\Xi$, the two abstract patterns $\bigvee\Xi$ and $(\bigvee\Xi)\cap C$ are different and $\bigvee\Xi \geqq (\bigvee\Xi)\cap C$ by Lemma 2.21. On the other hand, $(\bigvee\Xi)\cap C$ majorizes Ξ. These contradict the fact that $\bigvee\Xi$ is the supremum. □

Remark 2.24. It is not necessarily true that any element $\mathcal{P}_0$ in Π that majorizes Ξ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_0 = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}}$ is the supremum of Ξ.

The following lemma will be useful later.

Lemma 2.25. *Let F_j be a finite subset of X for $j = 1, 2$. Take a positive real number r such that for each $j = 1, 2$, any two distinct elements $x, y \in F_j$ satisfy $\rho(x, y) > 4r$. Suppose for each j and $x \in F_j$, there corresponds $\mathcal{P}_x^j \in \Pi$ such that $\emptyset \neq \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^j \subset B(x, r)$. Suppose also there is $\mathcal{Q}^j = \bigvee\{\mathcal{P}_x^j \mid x \in F_j\}$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then the following statements hold:*

1. *If $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}^1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}^2$, then for each $x \in F_1$ there is a unique $y \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2 \neq \emptyset$. In this case $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2$ holds.*
2. *If $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}^1 = \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}^2$, then for each $x \in F_1$ there is a unique $y \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 = \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2$.*
3. *If $\mathcal{Q}^1 = \mathcal{Q}^2$, then for each $x \in F_1$ there is a unique $y \in F_2$ such that $\mathcal{P}_x^1 = \mathcal{P}_y^2$.*

Proof. 1. By Lemma 2.23, $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}^j = \bigcup_{x\in F_j} \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^j$ for each $j = 1, 2$. For each $x \in F_1$, there is $y \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2 \neq \emptyset$. If there is another $y' \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_{y'}^2 \neq \emptyset$, then $B(x, r) \cap B(y, r) \neq \emptyset$ and $B(x, r) \cap B(y', r) \neq \emptyset$ and so $\rho(y, y') \leqq 4r$. By definition of r, we have $y = y'$. This shows the uniqueness of y. Uniqueness implies the last statement.

2. By 1., for each $x \in F_1$ there is $y \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2$. Applying 1. again, there is $x' \in F_1$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2 \subset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_{x'}^1$. We have $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_{x'}^1$ and by applying uniqueness in 1., we see $x = x'$.

3. By 2., for each $x \in F_1$ there is $y \in F_2$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_x^1 = \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_y^2$. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_x^1 = \mathcal{Q}^1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_1^x = \mathcal{Q}^2 \cap \operatorname{supp}\mathcal{P}_2^y = \mathcal{P}_y^2.$$

Uniqueness follows from uniqueness in 1. □

2.3 Glueable pattern spaces

In this subsection X is a metric space with a metric ρ and Π is a pattern space over X.

Often we want to "glue" abstract patterns to obtain a larger abstract pattern. For example, suppose Ξ is a collection of patches such that if $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Xi$, $S \in \mathcal{P}$ and $T \in \mathcal{Q}$, then we have either $S = T$ or $S \cap T = \emptyset$. Then we can "glue" patches in Ξ, that is, we can take a union $\bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \Xi} \mathcal{P}$, which is also a patch. Pattern spaces in which we can "glue" abstract patterns are called glueable pattern spaces (Definition 2.28).

Definition 2.26. 1. Two abstract patterns $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$ are said to be compatible if there is $\mathcal{R} \in \Pi$ such that $\mathcal{R} \supseteqq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R} \supseteqq \mathcal{Q}$.

2. A subset $\Xi \subset \Pi$ is said to be pairwise compatible if any two elements $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$ are compatible.

3. A subset $\Xi \subset \Pi$ is said to be locally finite if for any $x \in X$ and $r > 0$, the set $\Xi \cap B(x, r)$, which was defined in (3), is finite.

Lemma 2.27. *Let Ξ be a subset of Π and take $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. Then the following hold.*

1. *If Ξ is locally finite, then so is $\Xi \cap C$.*

2. *If Ξ is pairwise compatible, then so is $\Xi \cap C$.*

Proof. 1. Suppose there are $x \in X$, $r > 0$ such that $\Xi \cap C \cap B(x, r)$ is infinite. There are $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots$ in Ξ such that $\mathcal{P}_n \cap C \cap B(x, r)$ are all distinct. However by local finiteness of Ξ, there are distinct n and m such that $\mathcal{P}_n \cap B(x, r) = \mathcal{P}_m \cap B(x, r)$; this implies that $\mathcal{P}_n \cap C \cap B(x, r) = \mathcal{P}_m \cap C \cap B(x, r)$ and leads to a contradiction.

2. Take $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Xi$ arbitrarily. By Definition 2.26, there is $\mathcal{R} \in \Xi$ such that $\mathcal{R} \supseteqq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R} \supseteqq \mathcal{Q}$. By Lemma 2.21, we have $\mathcal{R} \cap C \supseteqq \mathcal{P} \cap C$ and $\mathcal{R} \cap C \supseteqq \mathcal{Q} \cap C$ and so $\mathcal{P} \cap C$ and $\mathcal{Q} \cap C$ are compatible. □

Definition 2.28. A pattern space Π over a metric space X is said to be glueable if the following two conditions hold:

1. If $\Xi \subset \Pi$ is both locally finite and pairwise compatible, then there is the supremum $\bigvee \Xi$ for Ξ.

2. If $\Xi \subset \Pi$ is both locally finite and pairwise compatible, then for any $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$,

$$\bigvee (\Xi \cap C) = (\bigvee \Xi) \cap C. \tag{4}$$

Remark 2.29. By Lemma 2.27, for $\Xi \subset \Pi$ which is locally finite and pairwise compatible and $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, the left-hand side of the equation (4) makes sense.

Lemma 2.30. *Let Π be glueable and Λ a set. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $\Xi_\lambda \subset \Pi$ be a subset and suppose $\bigcup_\lambda \Xi_\lambda$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible. Then for each λ, the set Ξ_λ is locally finite and pairwise-compatible and if we set $\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \bigvee \Xi_\lambda$, the set $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is locally finite and pairwise-compatible and*

$$\bigvee \bigcup_\lambda \Xi_\lambda = \bigvee \{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}.$$

Proof. Set $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee \bigcup_\lambda \Xi_\lambda$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\mathcal{Q} \in \Xi_\lambda$, we have $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$ and so $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}_\lambda$. This, in particular, shows that $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda\}$ is pairwise compatible. Moreover, since for each $x \in X$ and $r > 0$,

$$\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \cap B(x,r) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\} = \{\bigvee (\Xi_\lambda \cap B(x,r)) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}, \tag{5}$$

$\Xi_\lambda \cap B(x,r) \subset (\bigcup_\lambda \Xi_\lambda) \cap B(x,r)$ and $(\bigcup \Xi_\lambda) \cap B(x,r)$ is finite by assumption, the set (5) is finite: the set $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda\}$ is locally finite.

If $\mathcal{P}'$ is a majorant for $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda\}$, then $\mathcal{P}' \geqq \mathcal{Q}$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\mathcal{Q} \in \Xi_\lambda$, and so $\mathcal{P}' \geqq \mathcal{P}$. As was mentioned above, $\mathcal{P}$ is a majorant for $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda\}$, and so it is its supremum. □

We finish this subsection with examples.

Example 2.31. Consider $\Pi = \mathrm{Patch}(X)$ (Example 2.5). In this pattern space, for two elements $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathrm{Patch}(X)$, the following statements hold:

1. $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q} \iff \mathcal{P} \supset \mathcal{Q}$.
2. $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are compatible if and only if for any $T \in \mathcal{P}$ and $S \in \mathcal{Q}$, either $S = T$ or $S \cap T = \emptyset$ holds.

If $\Xi \subset \mathrm{Patch}(X)$ is pairwise compatible, then $\mathcal{P}_\Xi = \bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \Xi} \mathcal{P}$ is a patch, which is the supremum of Ξ. If $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then

$$(\bigvee \Xi) \cap C = (\bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \Xi} \mathcal{P}) \cap C = \bigcup (\mathcal{P} \cap C) = \bigvee (\Xi \cap C).$$

$\mathrm{Patch}(X)$ is glueable.

Example 2.32. For the pattern space 2^X in Example 2.8, two elements $A, B \in 2^X$ are compatible if and only if

$$\overline{A} \cap B \subset A \text{ and } A \cap \overline{B} \subset B. \tag{6}$$

In fact, if A and B are compatible, then there is a majorant C. By $C \supset A \cup B$,

$$A \cup (\overline{A} \cap B) = (A \cup B) \cap \overline{A} = C \cap \overline{A} \cap (A \cup B) = A \cap (A \cup B) = A,$$

and so $\overline{A} \cap B \subset A$. A similar argument shows that $\overline{B} \cap A \subset B$. Conversely, if the condition (6) holds, then $(A \cup B) \cap \overline{A} = A \cup (B \cap \overline{A}) = A$ and similarly $(A \cup B) \cap \overline{B} = B$, and so $A \cup B$ is a majorant for A and B.

Suppose $\Xi \subset 2^X$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible. Note that $\bigcup_{A \in \Xi} \overline{A} = \overline{\bigcup_{A \in \Xi} A}$. Set $A_\Xi = \bigcup_{A \in \Xi} A$. For each $A \in \Xi$, $A_\Xi \cap \overline{A} = \bigcup_{B \in \Xi} (B \cap \overline{A}) = A$; A_Ξ is a majorant of Ξ. If B is also a majorant for Ξ, then

$$B \cap \overline{A_\Xi} = B \cap (\bigcup_{A \in \Xi} \overline{A}) = \bigcup_{A \in \Xi} (B \cap \overline{A}) = \bigcup_{A \in \Xi} A = A_\Xi,$$

and so $B \geqq A_\Xi$. It turns out that A_Ξ is the supremum for Ξ. Moreover, if $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$, then $A_\Xi \cap C = \bigcup_{A \in \Xi} (A \cap C) = \bigvee (\Xi \cap C)$. Thus 2^X is a glueable space.

Remark 2.33. Let Π_0 be a glueable pattern space and $\Pi_1 \subset \Pi_0$ a pattern subspace. For any subset $\Xi \subset \Pi_1$, if it is pairwise compatible in Π_1, then it is pairwise compatible in Π_0. Moreover, whether a set is locally finite or not is independent of the ambient pattern space in which the set is included. For a subset $\Xi \subset \Pi_1$ which is locally finite and pairwise compatible in Π_1, since Π_0 is glueable, there is the supremum $\bigvee \Xi$ in Π_0. If this supremum in Π_0 is always included in Π_1, then Π_1 is glueable.

By this remark, it is easy to see the pattern spaces $\mathcal{C}(X)$ (Example 2.8), $\mathrm{LF}(X)$ (Example 2.6), and $\mathrm{UD}_r(X)$ (Example 2.7, r is an arbitrary positive number) are glueable.

However, $\mathrm{UD}(X)$ (Example 2.7) is not necessarily glueable. For example, set $X = \mathbb{R}$. Set $\mathcal{P}_n = \{n, n + \frac{1}{n}\}$ for each integer $n \neq 0$. Each $\mathcal{P}_n$ is in $\mathrm{UD}(\mathbb{R})$, $\Xi = \{\mathcal{P}_n \mid n \neq 0\}$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible, but it does not admit the supremum.

For the rest of this subsection we show that $\mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ (Example 2.9) is glueable, where X is a metric space, Y a set and $y_0 \in Y$.

Lemma 2.34. *Two maps $f, g \in \mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ are compatible if and only if $f|_{\operatorname{supp} f \cap \operatorname{supp} g} = g|_{\operatorname{supp} f \cap \operatorname{supp} g}$.*

Proof. Suppose f and g are compatible. Take a majorant $h \in \mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$. For each $x \in \operatorname{supp} f \cap \operatorname{supp} g$,

$$f(x) = (h \cap \operatorname{supp} f)(x) = h(x) = (h \cap \operatorname{supp} g)(x) = g(x).$$

Conversely suppose $f|_{\operatorname{supp} f \cap \operatorname{supp} g} = g|_{\operatorname{supp} f \cap \operatorname{supp} g}$. Define a map $h \in \mathrm{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ g(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} g \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This is well-defined. Next, $h \geqq f$ because

$$\begin{aligned}(h \cap \operatorname{supp} f)(x) =& \begin{cases} h(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{if } x \notin \operatorname{supp} f \end{cases} \\ =& \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{if } x \notin \operatorname{supp} f \end{cases} \\ =& f(x)\end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in X$. Similarly $h \geqq g$ and so f and g are compatible. □

Lemma 2.35. *For $f \in \operatorname{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$, $x \in X$ and two positive numbers $r > s > 0$, we have $\operatorname{supp}(f \cap B(x, r)) \supset (\operatorname{supp} f) \cap B(x, s)$. Consequently, $(\operatorname{supp}(f \cap B(x, r))) \cap B(x, s) = (\operatorname{supp} f) \cap B(x, s)$.*

Proof. Take $x' \in (\operatorname{supp} f) \cap B(x, s)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $x'' \in B(x', \varepsilon)$ such that $f(x'') \neq y_0$. If ε is small enough, this x'' is in $B(x, r)$ and so $(f \cap B(x, r))(x'') \neq y_0$. Since ε was arbitrary, $x' \in \operatorname{supp}(f \cap B(x, r))$. □

Lemma 2.36. *Let Ξ be a subset of $\operatorname{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$. Take $x \in X$ and two numbers r, s such that $r > s > 0$. Then if $\Xi \cap B(x, r)$ is finite, then $\{(\operatorname{supp} f) \cap B(x, s) \mid f \in \Xi\}$ is finite.*

Proof. Clear by Lemma 2.35. □

Lemma 2.37. *If $\Xi \subset \operatorname{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ is locally finite, then $\bigcup_{f \in \Xi} \operatorname{supp} f$ is closed.*

Proof. Take $x \in X \setminus (\bigcup_{f \in \Xi} \operatorname{supp} f)$. Since $\Xi \cap B(x, 1)$ is finite, by Lemma 2.36, $\{(\operatorname{supp} f) \cap B(x, \frac{1}{2}) \mid f \in \Xi\}$ is finite. There is $r > 0$ such that $B(x, r) \cap \operatorname{supp} f = \emptyset$ for any $f \in \Xi$. □

Proposition 2.38. *$\operatorname{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ is glueable.*

Proof. Suppose $\Xi \subset \operatorname{Map}(X, Y, y_0)$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible. Set

$$\begin{aligned} f_\Xi(x) =& \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if there is } f \in \Xi \text{ such that } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ =& \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if there is } f \in \Xi \text{ such that } f(x) \neq y_0 \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

This is well-defined by Lemma 2.34. For each $f \in \Xi$ and $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}(f_\Xi \cap \operatorname{supp} f)(x) =& \begin{cases} f_\Xi(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{if } x \notin \operatorname{supp} f \end{cases} \\ =& \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{if } x \notin \operatorname{supp} f \end{cases} \\ =& f(x),\end{aligned}$$

and so $f_\Xi \geqq f$. In other words, f_Ξ is a majorant for Ξ.

Next, we prove that f_Ξ is the supremum for Ξ. To this end, we first claim $\operatorname{supp} f_\Xi = \bigcup_{f\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} f$. It is clear that $\{x \in X \mid f_\Xi(x) \neq y_0\} \subset \bigcup_{f\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} f$ because if $f_\Xi(x) \neq y_0$, then there is $f \in \Xi$ such that $f(x) \neq y_0$. Together with Lemma 2.37, we see $\operatorname{supp} f_\Xi \subset \bigcup_{f\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} f$. Since f_Ξ is a majorant for Ξ, the reverse inclusion is clear, and so $\operatorname{supp} f_\Xi = \bigcup_{f\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} f$.

To prove that f_Ξ is the supremum, we next take a majorant g for Ξ arbitrarily. Since for $f \in \Xi$ and $x \in \operatorname{supp} f$, we have $g(x) = (g \cap \operatorname{supp} f)(x) = f(x)$, and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g \cap (\bigcup_{f\in\Xi} \operatorname{supp} f)(x) &= \begin{cases} g(x) & \text{if there is } f \in \Xi \text{ such that } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if there is } f \in \Xi \text{ such that } x \in \operatorname{supp} f \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= f_\Xi(x) \end{aligned}$$

for each $x \in X$, and so $g \cap (\operatorname{supp} f_\Xi) = f_\Xi$, namely $g \geqq f_\Xi$. We have shown f_Ξ is the supremum for Ξ; $f_\Xi = \bigvee \Xi$.

It remains to show that $f_\Xi \cap C$ is equal to $\bigvee(\Xi \cap C)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. This is the case because

$$\begin{aligned} (f_\Xi \cap C) &= \begin{cases} f_\Xi(x) & \text{if } x \in C \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in C \text{ and } f(x) \neq y_0 \text{ for some } f \in \Xi \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (f \cap C)(x) & \text{if there is } f \in \Xi \text{ such that } (f \cap C)(x) \neq y_0 \\ y_0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

2.4 Zero Element and Its Uniqueness

Definition 2.39. Let Π be a pattern space over a topological space X. An element $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ such that $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ is called a zero element of Π. If there is only one zero element in Π, it is denoted by 0.

Remark 2.40. Zero elements always exist. In fact, take an arbitrary element $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$. Then by Lemma 2.4, $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap \emptyset) = \emptyset$ and so $\mathcal{P} \cap \emptyset$ is a zero element.

Lemma 2.41. *If Π is a glueable pattern space over a topological space X, there is only one zero element in Π.*

Proof. The subset $\emptyset$ of Π is locally finite and pairwise compatible. Set $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.23, $\mathcal{P}$ is a zero element. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a zero element, then since $\mathcal{Q}$ is a majorant for $\emptyset$, we see $\mathcal{Q} \geqq \mathcal{P}$. We have $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q} \cap \emptyset = \mathcal{P}$. □

Lemma 2.42. *Let Π be a glueable pattern space over a topological space X. Take a locally finite and pairwise compatible subset Ξ of Π. Then $\bigvee \Xi \cup \{0\}$ exists and $\bigvee \Xi \cup \{0\} = \bigvee \Xi$.*

Proof. For any $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$, the abstract pattern $\mathcal{P} \cap \emptyset$ is a zero element and by the uniqueness of zero element (Lemma 2.41), $\mathcal{P} \cap \emptyset = 0$ and $\mathcal{P} \geqq 0$. Thus $\bigvee \Xi$ is a majorant for $\Xi \cup \{0\}$. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a majorant for $\Xi \cup \{0\}$, then it is a majorant for Ξ and so $\mathcal{Q} \geqq \bigvee \Xi$. This shows that $\bigvee \Xi$ is the supremum for $\Xi \cup \{0\}$. □

3 Γ-pattern spaces over X, or pattern spaces over (X, Γ)

Here we incorporate group actions to the theory of pattern spaces. First, we define pattern spaces over (X, Γ), or Γ-pattern spaces over X, where X is a topological space and a group Γ acts on X by homeomorphisms. We require there is an action of the group Γ on such a pattern space and the scissors operation is equivariant. In Subsection 3.2 we define local derivation by using the structure of Γ-pattern spaces. There we show several maps in aperiodic order send an abstract pattern $\mathcal{P}$ to a one which is mutually locally derivable (MLD) with $\mathcal{P}$; we solve the first question in Introduction affirmatively. The final two subsections (Subsection 3.3 and Subsection 3.4) prepare tools to prove Theorem 4.1. In Subsection 3.3 we "decompose" abstract patterns via Delone sets. In Subsection 3.4 we construct abstract patterns from "building blocks".

3.1 Definition and Examples

Setting 1. In this subsection, unless otherwise stated, X is a topological space, Γ is a group that acts on X as homeomorphisms, and Π is a pattern space over X.

Definition 3.1. Suppose there is a group action $\Gamma \curvearrowright \Pi$ such that for each $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi, C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have $(\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap (\gamma C) = \gamma(\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{C})$, that is, the scissors operation is equivariant. Then we say Π is a Γ-pattern space or a pattern space over (X, Γ). For a pattern space Π over (X, Γ), its nonempty subset Σ such that $\mathcal{P} \in \Sigma$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ imply $\gamma\mathcal{P} \in \Sigma$ is called a subshift of Π.

Examples are given after lemmas.

Lemma 3.2. *Let Π be a pattern space over (X, Γ). For $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \Pi$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, the following statements hold:*

1. $\gamma \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \operatorname{supp}(\gamma\mathcal{P})$.
2. *If $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$, then $\gamma\mathcal{P} \geqq \gamma\mathcal{Q}$.*

Lemma 3.3. *Let Π be a pattern space over (X,Γ). Suppose Π' is a pattern subspace of Π. If Π' is closed under the Γ-action, then Π' is a pattern space over (X,Γ).*

Lemma 3.4. *Let Λ be a set and $(\Pi_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a family of pattern spaces over (X,Γ). Then Γ acts on the product space $\prod_\lambda \Pi_\lambda$ by $\gamma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda = (\gamma\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda$ and by this action $\prod_\lambda \Pi_\lambda$ is a pattern space over (X,Γ).*

Proof. That $\prod \Pi_\lambda$ is a pattern space is proved in Lemma 2.14. For $\gamma\in\Gamma, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda)\in\prod\Pi_\lambda$ and $C\in\mathcal{C}(X)$, $\gamma((\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda\cap C) = (\gamma(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda)\cap\gamma C$ by a straightforward computation. □

Definition 3.5. The pattern space $\prod\Pi_\lambda$ is called the product Γ-pattern space.

Lemma 3.6. *Let Π be a pattern space over (X,Γ). Then the power pattern space 2^Π (Definition 2.17) is a pattern space over (X,Γ) by an action $\gamma\Xi = \{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P}\in\Xi\}$.*

Example 3.7. For $\mathcal{P}\in\mathrm{Patch}(X)$ and $\gamma\in\Gamma$, set $\gamma\mathcal{P} = \{\gamma T \mid T\in\mathcal{P}\}$. This defines an action of Γ on $\mathrm{Patch}(X)$ and makes $\mathrm{Patch}(X)$ a pattern space over (X,Γ).

Example 3.8. Let X be a metric space and a group Γ act on X as isometries. 2^X (Example 2.8) is a pattern space over (X,Γ). By Lemma 3.3, the spaces $\mathrm{LF}(X)$(Example 2.6), $\mathrm{UD}(X)$ and $\mathrm{UD}_r(X)$ (Example 2.7, $r>0$) are all pattern spaces over (X,Γ).

Example 3.9. Take a non-empty set Y, an element $y_0\in Y$ and an action $\phi\colon\Gamma\curvearrowright Y$ that fixes y_0. As was mentioned before (Example 2.9), $\mathrm{Map}(X,Y,y_0)$ is a pattern space over X. Define an action of Γ on $\mathrm{Map}(X,Y,y_0)$ by

$$(\gamma f)(x) = \phi(\gamma)(f(\gamma^{-1}x)).$$

For each $f\in\mathrm{Map}(X,Y,y_0)$, $\gamma\in\Gamma$ and $C\in\mathcal{C}(X)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma f)\cap(\gamma C)(x) &= \begin{cases}(\gamma f)(x) & \text{if } x\in\gamma C\\ y_0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\\ &= \begin{cases}\phi(\gamma)(f(\gamma^{-1}x)) & \text{if } \gamma^{-1}x\in C\\ \phi(\gamma)y_0 & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\\ &= \phi(\gamma)(f\cap C)(\gamma^{-1}x)\\ &= \gamma(f\cap C)(x),\end{aligned}$$

for each $x\in X$ and so $\mathrm{Map}(X,Y,y_0)$ is a pattern space over (X,Γ). This Γ-pattern space is denoted by $\mathrm{Map}_\phi(X,Y,y_0)$. If ϕ sends every group element to the identity, we denote the corresponding space by $\mathrm{Map}(X,Y,y_0)$.

Example 3.10. Let X be a locally compact σ-compact space and a group Γ act on X as homeomorphisms. The dual space $C_c(X)^*$ is a pattern space over X (Example 2.10). For $\varphi\in C_c(X)$ and $\gamma\in\Gamma$, set $(\gamma\varphi)(x) = \varphi(\gamma^{-1}x)$. For $\Phi\in C_c(X)^*$ and $\gamma\in\Gamma$, set $\gamma\Phi(\varphi) = \Phi(\gamma^{-1}\varphi)$. Then $C_c(X)^*$ is a pattern space over (X,Γ).

We mention two examples of subshifts.

Example 3.11. For a metric space X, its uniformly discrete and relatively dense subsets are called Delone sets. Definition of "uniformly discrete" was given in Example 2.7; a subset $D \subset X$ is relatively dense if there is $R > 0$ such that $D \cap B(x.R)^\circ \neq \emptyset$ for each $x \in X$. The set $\mathrm{Del}(X)$ of all Delone sets in X is a subshift of $\mathrm{UD}(X)$.

Example 3.12. For a topological space X, a patch $\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Patch}(X)$ is called a tiling if $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{T} = X$. The space of all tilings is a subshift of $\mathrm{Patch}(X)$.

Definition 3.13. Let X be a metric space and Γ a group which acts on X as isometries. Let Π be a pattern space over (X, Γ). We say Π is a glueable pattern space over (X, Γ) if it is a glueable pattern space over X. For a glueable pattern space Π, its subshift Σ is said to be glueable if for any pairwise compatible and locally finite $\Xi \subset \Sigma$, we have $\bigvee \Xi \in \Sigma$.

Lemma 3.14. *Let X be a metric space and Γ a group which acts on X as isometries. Let Π be a glueable pattern space over (X, Γ). If $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\Xi \subset \Pi$ is a subset which is both locally finite and pairwise compatible, then $\gamma\Xi$ (Lemma 3.6) is both locally finite and pairwise compatible. In this case, we have*

$$\gamma \bigvee \Xi = \bigvee (\gamma \Xi).$$

Proof. If $\mathcal{P} \in \Xi$ and $\mathcal{Q} \in \Xi$, then there is $\mathcal{R} \in \Pi$ such that $\mathcal{R} \geqq \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$. By Lemma 3.2, we see $\gamma\mathcal{R} \geqq \gamma\mathcal{P}$ and $\gamma\mathcal{R} \geqq \gamma\mathcal{Q}$ and so $\gamma\mathcal{P}$ and $\gamma\mathcal{Q}$ are compatible. If $x \in X$ and $r > 0$ then since γ is an isometry, $\gamma^{-1}B(x, r) = B(\gamma^{-1}x, r)$. By

$$\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, r) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \Xi\} = \gamma\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(\gamma^{-1}x, r) \mid \mathcal{P} \in \Xi\},$$

we see this set is finite. We have proved $\gamma\Xi$ is both pairwise compatible and locally finite.

Next, we show the latter statement. We use Lemma 3.2 several times. For any $\mathcal{P} \in \Xi$, $\gamma \bigvee \Xi \geqq \gamma\mathcal{P}$. This means that $\gamma \bigvee \Xi$ is a majorant for $\gamma\Xi$. To show this is the supremum, take a majorant $\mathcal{R}$ for $\gamma\Xi$. Then $\gamma^{-1}\mathcal{R}$ is a majorant for Ξ and so $\gamma^{-1}\mathcal{R} \geqq \bigvee \Xi$. We have $\mathcal{R} \geqq \gamma \bigvee \Xi$, and so $\gamma \bigvee \Xi$ is the supremum for $\gamma\Xi$. □

3.2 Local derivability

Setting 2. In this subsection, X, Y and Z are non-empty metric spaces and Γ is a group which acts on X, Y and Z as isometries.

Local derivability was defined in [3] for tilings or more generally patterns in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Here we generalize it and define local derivability for two abstract patterns $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$. Note that these $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ may be in different pattern spaces Π_1 and Π_2, and these Π_1 and Π_2 may be over different metric spaces X and Y. However, we assume Π_1 and Π_2 are Γ-pattern spaces for the same group Γ.

Lemma 3.15. *Let Π_1 be a pattern space over (X, Γ) and Π_2 a pattern space over (Y, Γ). For two abstract patterns $\mathcal{P}_1 \in \Pi_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 \in \Pi_2$, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

1. *There exist $x_0 \in X$, $y_0 \in Y$ and $R_0 \geqq 0$ such that if $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$, $R \geqq 0$ and*

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_0, R + R_0) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_0, R + R_0),$$

   then

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_0, R) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_0, R).$$

2. *For any $x_1 \in X$ and $y_1 \in Y$ there exists $R_1 \geqq 0$ such that if $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$, $R \geqq 0$ and*

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_1, R + R_1) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_1, R + R_1),$$

   then

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_1, R) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_1, R).$$

Proof. It suffices to show only the implication 1.⇒2. By 1., there are x_0, y_0 and R_0 that satisfy the condition in 1. Take $x_1 \in X$ and $y_1 \in Y$ arbitrarily. Set $R_1 = R_0 + \rho_X(x_0, x_1) + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1)$, where ρ_X, ρ_Y are the metrics for X and Y, respectively. Take $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and $R > 0$ arbitrarily and suppose

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_1, R_1 + R) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_1, R_1 + R). \tag{7}$$

Since $B(x_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1) + R_0) \subset B(x_1, R_1 + R)$, by taking scissors operation for both sides of (7), we obtain

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1) + R_0) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_1) \cap B(x_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1) + R_0),$$

and so

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1)) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1)).$$

By $B(y_1, R) \subset B(y_0, R + \rho_Y(y_0, y_1))$,

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_1, R) = (\eta\mathcal{P}_2) \cap B(y_1, R).$$

□

Definition 3.16. Let Π_1 be a pattern space over (X, Γ) and Π_2 be a pattern space over (Y, Γ). If $\mathcal{P}_1 \in \Pi_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 \in \Pi_2$ satisfy the two equivalent conditions in Lemma 3.15, then we say $\mathcal{P}_2$ is locally derivable from $\mathcal{P}_1$ and write $\mathcal{P}_1 \overset{\text{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}_2$. If both $\mathcal{P}_1 \overset{\text{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 \overset{\text{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}_1$ hold, we say $\mathcal{P}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2$ are mutually locally derivable (MLD) and write $\mathcal{P}_1 \overset{\text{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{P}_2$.

The following two lemmas are easy to prove.

Lemma 3.17. *1. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an abstract pattern in a pattern space over (X, Γ). Then $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{P}$.*

2. Let $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{R}$ be abstract patterns in pattern spaces over $(X, \Gamma), (Y, \Gamma)$, and (Z, Γ), respectively. If $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{R}$, then $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{R}$. Consequently, if $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{Q} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{R}$, then $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 3.18. *Let Π_1 be a pattern space over (X, Γ) and Π_2 be a pattern space over (Y, Γ). Take two abstract patterns $\mathcal{P}_1 \in \Pi_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_2 \in \Pi_2$ and suppose $\mathcal{P}_1 \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}_2$. Then for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, we have $\gamma\mathcal{P}_1 \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \gamma\mathcal{P}_2$.*

We use the following notion in Section 5.

Definition 3.19. Let Π be a pattern space over (X, Γ). $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ is said to be Delone-deriving if there is a Delone set D in X such that $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} D$.

Remark 3.20. Delone sets are Delone-deriving. If a tiling consists of finitely many types of tiles up to Γ and each tile T admits a fixed point of its symmetry group $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma T$, then the tiling is Delone-deriving.

We finish this subsection by showing several canonical maps in aperiodic order send an abstract pattern $\mathcal{P}$ to a one which is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$.

Proposition 3.21. *Let X be a locally compact proper metric space on which a group Γ acts as isometries. Let D be a uniformly discrete subset of X and set $\mu = \sum_{x \in D} \delta_x$, the sum of Dirac measures with respect to the vague topology. If we regard D as an abstract pattern of $\mathrm{UD}(X)$ (Example 3.8) and μ an abstract pattern of $C_c(X)^*$ (Example 3.10), we have the following:*

1. *$\mu \cap C = \sum_{x \in D \cap C} \delta_x$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}(X)$,*
2. *$\gamma\mu = \sum_{x \in \gamma D} \delta_x$, and*
3. *$\mu \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} D$.*

Proof. The first two is clear by definition and the third condition follows from the first two conditions. □

Proposition 3.22. *Let Γ be a σ-compact locally compact abelian group and μ its Haar measure. Let f be a complex valued continuous bounded function on Γ. If we regard f as an abstract pattern in $\mathrm{Map}(\Gamma, \mathbb{C}, 0)$ (Example 3.9) and $f d\mu$ as an element of $C_c(\Gamma)^*$ (Example 3.10) that sends $\varphi \in C_c(\Gamma)$ to $\int \varphi f d\mu$, we have $f \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} f d\mu$.*

Proof. Take $R > 0$ and $s, t \in \Gamma$ and assume

$$(f - s) \cap B(e, R) = (f - t) \cap B(e, R). \tag{8}$$

Here, $f - t$ and $f - s$ denote the image of f by the group action. For each $\varphi \in C_c(\Gamma)$, the image by $(f d\mu - s) \cap B(e, R)$ is $\int_{B(e,R)} \varphi(x) f(x+s) d\mu$ and the image by $(f d\mu - t) \cap B(e, R)$ is $\int_{B(e,R)} \varphi(x) f(x+t) d\mu$. By (8), for each $x \in B(e, R)$,

$$f(x + t) = f \cap B(t, R)(x + t) = (f - t) \cap B(0, R)(t) = (f - s) \cap B(e, R)(x) = f(x + s),$$

and so the images of φ by $(f d\mu - s) \cap B(e, R)$ and $(f d\mu - t) \cap B(e, R)$ are the same, and so these two maps are the same.

Conversely, suppose $R > 0$, $s, t \in \Gamma$ and

$$(f d\mu - s) \cap B(e, R + 1) = (f d\mu - t) \cap B(e, R + 1).$$

For any $\varphi \in C_c(\Gamma)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \varphi \subset B(e, R + 1)$, we have

$$\int \varphi(x) f(x + s) d\mu(x) = \int \varphi(x) f(x + t) d\mu(x),$$

and so for any $x \in B(e, R)$, we have $f(x + s) = f(x + t)$ and

$$(f - s) \cap B(e, R) = (f - t) \cap B(e, R).$$

□

For the rest of this subsection, $(\mathbb{R}^d, \rho)$ is the Euclidean space with the Euclidean metric and D is a Delone subset (Example 3.11) of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is relatively dense with respect to $R > 0$ and uniformly discrete with respect to $r > 0$.

Definition 3.23. For each $x \in D$, set

$$V_x = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \rho(x, y) < \rho(x', y) \text{ for any } x' \in D \setminus \{x\}.\}$$

Lemma 3.24. *For each $x \in D$, V_x is nonempty and $V_x \subset B(x, R)^\circ$. Moreover,*

$$V_x = \{y \in B(x, R)^\circ \mid \ \rho(x, y) < \rho(x', y) \text{ for each } x' \in D'\} \tag{9}$$

for each D' with $D \setminus \{x\} \cap B(x, 2R) \subset D' \subset D \setminus \{x\}$. In particular V_x is open for each $x \in D$.

Proof. If $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\rho(x, y) < r/2$, then $y \in V_x$. Thus $V_x \neq \emptyset$. If $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(x, R)^\circ$, then since there is $x' \in D \cap B(y, R)^\circ$, we have $\rho(x', y) < R \leqq \rho(x, y)$ and so $y \notin V_x$.

Assume $y \in B(x, R)^\circ$ and $\rho(x, y) < \rho(x', y)$ for each $x' \in (D \setminus \{x\}) \cap B(x, 2R)$. If $x' \in D \setminus \{x\}$ and $\rho(x, x') > 2R$, then $\rho(x', y) \geqq \rho(x, x') - \rho(x, y) > R > \rho(x, y)$ and so $y \in V_x$. This observation shows the equality (9). □

Definition 3.25. For each $x \in D$, set $U_x = V_x \setminus \{x\}$. Set $\mathcal{T} = \{U_x \mid x \in D\}$.

Lemma 3.26. *$\mathcal{T}$ is a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.24, U_x is open, bounded and nonempty. By definition of V_x, if $x \neq x'$ we have $U_x \cap U_{x'} = \emptyset$. Next we take $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and show that there is $x \in D$ such that $y \in \overline{U_x}$. To this purpose we may assume that $y \neq x$ for any $x \in D$. Since $\{x \in D \mid \rho(x,y) < R\}$ is finite and nonempty, $F = \{x \in D \mid \rho(x,y) \leqq \rho(x',y) \text{ for any } x' \in D\}$ is nonempty and finite. Take $x \in F$. For each $t \in (0,1)$, set $y_t = tx + (1-t)y$. Then $\rho(x, y_t) = \|(1-t)(y-x)\|$. If $x' \in D$ and $\{y-x, y-x'\}$ is linearly independent, we have

$$\rho(x', y_t) = \|(1-t)y + tx - x'\| > \|y - x'\| - t\|y - x\| \geqq (1-t)\|y-x\| = \rho(x, y_t).$$

If $x' \in D \setminus \{x\}$ and $\{y-x, y-x'\}$ is linearly dependent, then there is $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x' - y = \lambda(x-y)$. Since $\lambda > 1$ or $\lambda \leqq -1$, we see $\rho(y_t, x) < \rho(y_t, x')$. By these observations we see $y_t \in V_x$, and so $y \in \overline{V_x} = \overline{U_x}$. □

Remark 3.27. There is $r > 0$ such that $B(x,r) \subset U_x \cup \{x\}$. Conversely, if $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U_x$ and there is $r > 0$ such that $B(y,r) \subset U_x \cup \{y\}$, then $x = y$. Thus if $x, y \in D$, $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and $\gamma U_x = \eta U_y$, then $\gamma x = \eta y$.

Proposition 3.28. *Let Γ be a closed subgroup of $E(d)$. If we regard D as an element of $\mathrm{UD}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$, and $\mathcal{T}$ as an element of $\mathrm{Patch}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is also a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$, we have $D \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. Take $L > 0$ and $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and assume

$$(\gamma D) \cap B(0, L+2R) = (\eta D) \cap B(0, L+2R). \tag{10}$$

Suppose $x \in D$ and $\gamma U_x \subset B(0,L)$. Since $\gamma x \in B(0,L)$, by (10), we see $\gamma x \in \eta D$ and $y = \eta^{-1}\gamma x \in D$. By setting $D' = (D \setminus \{x\}) \cap B(\gamma^{-1}0, L+2R)$ in Lemma 3.24, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma U_x &= \gamma\{z \in B(x,R)^\circ \mid \rho(x,z) < \rho(x',z) \text{ for any } x' \in (D \setminus \{x\}) \cap B(\gamma^{-1}0, L+2R)\} \\
&= \{z \in B(\gamma x, R)^\circ \mid \rho(\gamma x, z) < \rho(x', z) \text{ for any } x' \in' (\gamma D) \cap B(0, L+2R) \setminus \{\gamma x\}\ \} \\
&= \{z \in B(\eta y, R)^\circ \mid \rho(\eta y, z) < \rho(x', z) \text{ for any } x' \in (\eta D) \cap B(0, L+2R) \setminus \{\eta y\})\} \\
&= \eta U_y,
\end{aligned}$$

and so $\gamma U_x \in \eta\mathcal{T}$. We have shown $(\gamma\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0,L) \subset \eta\mathcal{T}$ and by symmetry this implies that $(\gamma\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0,L) = (\eta\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0,L)$.

Conversely, assume $L > 0$, $\eta, \gamma \in \Gamma$ and

$$(\gamma\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0, L+R) = (\eta\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0, L+R). \tag{11}$$

If $x \in D$ and $\gamma x \in B(0,L)$, then $\gamma U_x \subset B(0, L+R)$ and so by (11) we have $\gamma U_x \in (\eta\mathcal{T}) \cap B(0, L+R)$. There is $y \in D$ such that $\gamma U_x = \eta U_y$, and so $\gamma x = \eta y \in \eta D$. We have shown $(\gamma D) \cap B(0,L) \subset \eta D$ and by symmetry we obtain $(\gamma D) \cap B(0,L) = (\eta D) \cap B(0,L)$. □

3.3 Decomposition of Abstract Patterns by Delone Sets

Setting 3. Here is the setting of this subsection. (X, ρ) is a metric space and Γ is a group which acts on X transitively as isometries. We take $x_0 \in X$ and fix it. Assume there are a left invariant metric ρ_Γ for Γ and $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$\rho(\gamma x_0, \eta x_0) \leqq \rho_\Gamma(\gamma, \eta) \leqq \rho(\gamma x_0, \eta x_0) + C_0$$

holds for any $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$. (We use this inequality only for Proposition 3.36.) Π is a glueable pattern space over (X, Γ).

Definition 3.29. Take an abstract pattern $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$. We say a pair (D, R) of a Delone set in X and a positive number $R > 0$ decomposes $\mathcal{P}$ if the following three conditions are satisfied:

1. $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} D$,
2. $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R) \mid x \in D\}$, and
3. $\max_{x \in D} \operatorname{card} \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R)$ is finite.

Lemma 3.30. *If (D, R_0) decomposes $\mathcal{P}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, then $(\gamma D, R_0)$ decomposes $\gamma\mathcal{P}$.*

For the rest of this subsection $\mathcal{P}$ is an element of Π, D a Delone set in X and R_0 a positive real number and assume that (D, R_0) decomposes $\mathcal{P}$.

Lemma 3.31. *There are a set Λ and $\mathcal{P}_\lambda \in \Pi$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ such that*

1. *for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset B(x_0, R_0)$, and*
2. *for each $x \in D$ there are a unique $\lambda_x \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0) = \gamma\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_x}$ and $x = \gamma x_0$.*

Proof. Define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on D as follows: we have $x \sim y$ if there is $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that (1) $\gamma x = y$, and (2) $\gamma(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)) = \mathcal{P} \cap B(y, R_0)$. Then by taking one point from each equivalence class for $\sim$, we obtain a set Λ.

For each $x \in \Lambda$, take an element $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma_x x_0 = x$. Set $\mathcal{P}_x = \gamma_x^{-1}(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0))$; then Λ and $\mathcal{P}_x, x \in \Lambda$, satisfy the conditions. □

Remark 3.32. By the second condition of Lemma 3.31, we see $\operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_{x_0}} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda_x}$ is conjugate to $\operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)$. In particular, $\operatorname{card} \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_{x_0}} \mathcal{P}_\lambda$, where $\lambda \in \Lambda$, is bounded from above.

Definition 3.33. The tuple of abstract patterns $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ which satisfies the conditions in Lemma 3.31 is called the tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, R_0). For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, set

$$\Gamma_\lambda = \Gamma_\lambda(\mathcal{P}, D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda) = \{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \gamma x_0 \in D \text{ and } \mathcal{P} \cap B(\gamma x_0, R_0) = \gamma\mathcal{P}_\lambda\}$$

and call the tuple $(\Gamma_\lambda)_\lambda$ the recipe for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda))$.

The tuple of ingredients are "components" for $\mathcal{P}$, and the recipe describes how we construct $\mathcal{P}$ from the ingredients.

Lemma 3.34. *Let $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, R_0). Let $(\Gamma_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be the recipe for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda))_\lambda$. For any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a tuple of ingredients for $\gamma\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, R_0) and $(\gamma\Gamma_\lambda)_\lambda$ is the recipe for $\gamma\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda))_\lambda$.*

Proof. Clear from the definition. □

Remark 3.35. Let $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, R_0). Let (Γ_λ) be the recipe for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda))$. Then

$$\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0) \mid x \in D\} = \{\gamma\mathcal{P}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \gamma \in \Gamma_\lambda\}.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{P}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \gamma \in \Gamma_\lambda\}$.

Proposition 3.36. *Let $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ be a tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, R_0) and (Γ_λ) the recipe for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda))$. If we regard (Γ_λ) as an abstract pattern of $\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda} 2^\Gamma$, which is a pattern space over (Γ, Γ), (Lemma 3.4, Definition 3.5, Example 3.8) we have*

$$\mathcal{P} \overset{\text{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} (\Gamma_\lambda)_\lambda.$$

Proof. A proof of $\mathcal{P} \overset{\text{LD}}{\to} (\Gamma_\lambda)_\lambda$. Let $R_1 > 0$ be a constant for the local derivation $\mathcal{P} \overset{\text{LD}}{\to} D$ for points x_0 and $e \in \Gamma$ which appears in the definition of local derivability (Definition 3.16). Let L_0 be an arbitrary positive real number. Set $L_1 = L_0 + R_0 + R_1$. We assume $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_1) = (\eta\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_1) \tag{12}$$

and show

$$(\gamma\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_0) = (\eta\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_0) \tag{13}$$

for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$.

Take $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and fix it. By (12), we see

$$(\gamma D) \cap B(x_0, L_0 + R_0) = (\eta D) \cap B(x_0, L_0 + R_0).$$

Let ζ be an element of Γ_λ such that $\gamma\zeta \in B(e, L_0)$. We claim that $\gamma\zeta \in \eta\Gamma_\lambda$. By the definition of the recipe, $\zeta x_0 \in D$ and $\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \mathcal{P} \cap B(\zeta x_0, R_0)$. Since $\rho(\gamma\zeta x_0, x_0) \leqq$

$\rho_\Gamma(\gamma\zeta, e) \leqq L_0$, $\gamma\zeta x_0 \in (\gamma D) \cap B(x, L_0) = (\eta D) \cap B(x_0, L_0)$, and so there is $y \in D$ such that $\eta y = \gamma\zeta x_0$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda &= (\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap B(\gamma\zeta x_0, R_0)\\ &= (\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_1) \cap B(\gamma\zeta x_0, R_0)\\ &= (\eta\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_1) \cap B(\eta y, R_0)\\ &= \eta(\mathcal{P} \cap B(y, R_0)).\end{aligned}$$

We have proved $\eta^{-1}\gamma\zeta x_0 \in D$ and $\eta^{-1}\gamma\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \mathcal{P} \cap B(\eta^{-1}\gamma\zeta x_0, R_0)$, and so $\eta^{-1}\gamma\zeta \in \Gamma_\lambda$, by which we proved the claim. Thus $(\gamma\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_0) \subset (\eta\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_0)$ and by symmetry we have shown (13).

A proof of $(\Gamma_\lambda)_\lambda \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}$. Let $L_0 > 0$ be an arbitrary positive number and set $L_1 = L_0 + R_0 + C_0$. Assume $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and

$$(\gamma\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_1) = (\eta\Gamma_\lambda) \cap B(e, L_1) \tag{14}$$

holds for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\xi \in \Gamma_\lambda$, if we have $(\gamma\xi\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \neq 0$, then $B(\gamma\xi x_0, R_0) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \neq \emptyset$. This implies $\rho(\gamma\xi x_0, x_0) \leqq L_0 + R_0$ and $\rho_\Gamma(\gamma\xi, e) \leqq L_0 + R_0 + C_0 = L_1$. We have the same observation if we replace γ with η. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&\{(\gamma\xi\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \xi \in \Gamma_\lambda\} \cup \{0\}\\ &\qquad = \{(\gamma\xi\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0)) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda,\ \xi \in \Gamma_\lambda \text{ and } \gamma\xi \in B(e, L_1)\} \cup \{0\}\\ &\qquad = \{(\eta\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda,\ \zeta \in \Gamma_\lambda \text{ and } \eta\zeta \in B(e, L_1)\} \cup \{0\}\\ &\qquad = \{(\eta\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda)B(x_0, R_0) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \zeta \in \Gamma_\lambda\} \cup \{0\}.\end{aligned}$$

We obtain the desired result by Lemma 2.42 and Lemma 3.14:

$$\begin{aligned}(\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_0) &= \bigvee\{(\gamma\xi\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \xi \in \Gamma_\lambda\} \cup \{0\}\\ &= \bigvee\{(\eta\zeta\mathcal{P}_\lambda) \cap B(x_0, L_0) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \zeta \in \Gamma_\lambda\} \cup \{0\}\\ &= (\eta\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x_0, L_0).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.37. For tilings and Delone sets we have the concept of finite local complexity (FLC). We can generalize this concept to arbitrary pattern spaces. If $\mathcal{P}$ has FLC, then the index set Λ in Definition 3.33 is finite.

3.4 Families of building blocks and admissible digits

In the last subsection, we studied the decomposition of abstract patterns. Here we study construction of abstract patterns from "building blocks".

Setting 4. In this subsection X is a proper metric space and Γ is a group which acts on X as isometries. Let Σ be a glueable subshift inside a glueable pattern space Π over (X, Γ).

Here we define and study "building blocks" and "admissible digits". A family of building blocks is a family of abstract patterns located around a fixed point $x_0 \in X$ such that we can easily construct abstract patterns by "juxtaposing them". For example, take two numbers r, s such that $\frac{1}{2} > r > s > 0$. Set $\mathcal{P} = \{0\}$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{0, r\}$. These are abstract patterns in $\mathrm{UD}_s(\mathbb{R})$ (Example 2.7), which is regarded as a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ by a natural action. We can easily construct s-uniformly discrete set by juxtaposing these two abstract patterns $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$. For example, set $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}} = 4\mathbb{Z}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}} = 4\mathbb{Z} + 2$, then the set $(\mathcal{P} + \Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}) \cup (\mathcal{Q} + \Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is an s-uniformly discrete set obtained by juxtaposing the two abstract patterns according to $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Such a tuple $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}, \Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is called an admissible digit. The family $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q}\}$ becomes a family of building blocks for $(0, r)$ in the following Definition 3.38.

Definition 3.38. Take a point $x_0 \in X$ and a positive number $r > 0$ arbitrarily. A subset $\mathfrak{F} \subset \Sigma$ is called a family of building blocks of Σ for (x_0, r) if the following three conditions are satisfied:

1. $\mathfrak{F} \neq \emptyset$ and $\emptyset \neq \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \subset B(x_0, r)$ for each $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}$.
2. If $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $\rho(\gamma x_0, \eta x_0) > 4r$, then $\gamma\mathcal{P}$ and $\eta\mathcal{Q}$ are compatible.
3. If $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathfrak{F}$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\gamma\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$, then $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$ and $\gamma x_0 = x_0$.

The elements of $\mathfrak{F}$ are called building blocks for (x_0, r). If a building block $\mathcal{P}$ for (x_0, r) additionally satisfies a condition

$$\mathrm{Sym}_{\Gamma} \mathcal{P} = \Gamma_{x_0},$$

then $\mathcal{P}$ is called a symmetric building block for (x_0, r).

Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of building blocks of Σ for (x_0, r). Then a tuple $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}}$ of subsets $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \Gamma$ is called an admissible digit if it satisfies the condition

$$\text{If } \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathfrak{F},\ \gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{P}},\ \eta \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}} \text{ and } \rho(\gamma x_0, \eta x_0) \leqq 4r, \text{ then } \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q} \text{ and } \gamma\mathcal{P} = \eta\mathcal{Q}.$$

Remark 3.39. A non-empty subset of a family of building blocks is again a family of building blocks.

Lemma 3.40. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of building blocks for (x_0, r) and $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}}$ be an admissible digit. Then $\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible.*

Proof. Clear by definition. □

Since a family of building blocks is inside a glueable subshift, we can freely take a supremum $\bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ under the same condition as in Lemma 3.40.

We finish this subsection by proving two lemmas which will be useful in Section 5.

Lemma 3.41. *Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of building blocks for (x_0, r). Take a real number $r' > 2r$ arbitrarily. Let $(\Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathfrak{F}}$ be an admissible digit for each λ, where λ belongs to an index set Λ, such that*

1. *for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, we have $\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathfrak{F}} \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}} \neq \emptyset$, and*
2. *for each λ and $\mathcal{P}$, any element $\gamma \in \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}$ satisfies a condition*

$$\rho(x_0, \gamma x_0) < r' - 2r. \tag{15}$$

Set $\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \gamma \in \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then the family $\{\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ satisfies the first two conditions of the definition of family of building blocks (Definition 3.38).

Proof. The first condition. Take $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and fix it. Since $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \overline{\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathfrak{F},\gamma\in\Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}} \operatorname{supp}\gamma\mathcal{P}}$, it is nonempty. We have moreover $\operatorname{supp}\gamma\mathcal{P} \subset B(\gamma x_0, r) \subset B(x_0, r')$ by (15), for each $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}$, and so $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{Q}_\lambda \subset B(x_0, r')$.

The second condition. Take $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ such that $\rho(\gamma x_0, \eta x_0) > 4r'$. We show that $\gamma\mathcal{Q}_\lambda$ and $\eta\mathcal{Q}_\mu$ are compatible. For each $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{Q} \in \mathfrak{F}$, $\xi \in \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\zeta \in \Gamma^\mu_{\mathcal{Q}}$, by (15), we have $\rho(\gamma\xi x_0, \eta\zeta x_0) > 4r$. Thus $\gamma\xi\mathcal{P}$ and $\eta\zeta\mathcal{Q}$ are compatible and so together with Lemma 3.40, the set $\Xi_1 \cup \Xi_2$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible. Here,

$$\Xi_1 = \{\gamma\xi\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \xi \in \Gamma^\lambda_{\mathcal{P}}\},$$

and

$$\Xi_2 = \{\eta\zeta\mathcal{Q} \mid \mathcal{Q} \in \mathfrak{F}, \zeta \in \Gamma^\mu_{\mathcal{Q}}\}.$$

By Lemma 2.30 and the fact that $\gamma\mathcal{Q}_\lambda = \bigvee \Xi_1$ and $\eta\mathcal{Q}_\mu = \bigvee \Xi_2$, we see $\gamma\mathcal{Q}_\lambda$ and $\eta\mathcal{Q}_\mu$ are compatible. □

Remark 3.42. In Lemma 3.41, the third condition is not always satisfied. When we use this lemma in Section 4, we prove the third condition in an ad hoc way.

Lemma 3.43. *Take $x_0 \in X$ and $r > 0$ arbitrarily. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a family of building blocks for (x_0, r). Take two admissible digits $(\Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathfrak{F}}$ and $(\Gamma^2_{\mathcal{P}})_{\mathcal{P}\in\mathfrak{F}}$. Suppose both $\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \Gamma^2_{\mathcal{P}}$ are finite. Suppose also that*

$$\bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \gamma \in \Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}}\} = \bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{P} \mid \mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}, \gamma \in \Gamma^2_{\mathcal{P}}\}.$$

Then for any $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}}$ there is $\eta \in \Gamma^2_{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\gamma\mathcal{P} = \eta\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Consider two finite sets

$$F_1 = \{\gamma x_0 \mid \gamma \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}}\}$$

and

$$F_2 = \{\gamma x_0 \mid \gamma \in \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}} \Gamma^2_{\mathcal{P}}\}.$$

For each $x \in F_1$, there are $\mathcal{P} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma^1_{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $x = \gamma x_0$. Set $\mathcal{P}^1_x = \gamma\mathcal{P}$. This is independent of the choice of $\mathcal{P}$ and γ. Define $\mathcal{P}^2_x$ for each $x \in F_2$ in a similar way. We can apply Lemma 2.25. □

4 Translation theorem for certain abstract patterns

Here we prove Theorem 4.1, which answers the second question given in Introduction. In Subsection4.1 we prepare necessary lemmas to prove this theorem. In Subsection 4.2 we give a proof of Theorem 4.1.

Setting 5. In this section $X = \mathbb{R}^d$ and Γ is a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{E}(d)$ that contains $\mathbb{R}^d$. Π_1 and Π_2 are glueable pattern spaces over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$. Let Σ be a glueable subshift inside Π_2. We assume Σ contains sufficiently many symmetric building blocks, which means that for each $r > 0$, there is a symmetric building block $\mathcal{P}_r$ for $(0, r)$ (Definition 3.38).

In this setting we prove

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}$ be an abstract pattern in Π_1 which consists of bounded components (Definition 2.18) and is Delone-deriving (Definition 3.19). Then there is an abstract pattern $\mathcal{S}$ in Σ such that $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{S}$. Moreover,* $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{S}$ *is relatively dense in $\mathbb{R}^d$.*

Remark 4.2. This theorem holds if we replace $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$ with a pair (X, Γ) of a proper metric space X and a group Γ that acts on X transitively as isometies such that inequality (1), Lemma 4.4, Lemma 4.8 and Lemma 4.9 hold if we replace 2 on the right-hand side of (1) with some positive number and $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in these assertions with some point in X.

Remark 4.3. If $\Sigma = \mathrm{UD}_r(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the one-point set $\mathcal{P} = \{0\}$ is a symmetric building block and so this Σ satisfies the condition in Theorem 4.1. Thus for any Π_1 and $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_1$ which satisfy the condition in Theorem 4.1, we obtain a uniformly discrete set $\mathcal{S}$ with relatively dense support, that is, a Delone set, which is MLD with $\mathcal{P}$.

In Section 5 we give sufficient conditions for a subshift of functions to have sufficiently many symmetric building blocks. We will be able to apply Theorem 4.1 when Σ is a space of certain functions under a mild condition.

4.1 Preliminary Lemmas

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\mathfrak{G}$ be a subset of Γ_0 which is at most countable. Suppose $\max_{G\in\mathfrak{G}} \operatorname{card} G < \infty$. Then for each two numbers r, s such that $r > s > 0$, there are $\varepsilon > 0$ and a point $y_G \in B(0,r)^\circ \setminus B(0,s)$ for each $G \in \mathfrak{G}$ such that*

1. *if $G \in \mathfrak{G}$ and $\gamma \in G \setminus \{e\}$, then $\rho(y_G, \gamma y_G) > \varepsilon$, and*
2. *if $G \neq H$, then $\rho(0, y_G) \neq \rho(0, y_H)$.*

To prove Lemma 4.4, we prepare the following notation.

Definition 4.5. For any $A \in \mathrm{O}(d)$, $r > 0$ and $\varepsilon \geqq 0$, set

$$S_{A,\varepsilon,r} = \{x \in B(0,r) \mid \rho(Ax, x) \leqq \varepsilon\}.$$

Lemma 4.6. *If the order of an element $A \in O(d)$ is less than an integer m, then $S_{A,\varepsilon,r} \subset S_{A,\varepsilon,0} + B(0, \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon)$.*

Proof. Take an element $x \in S_{A,\varepsilon,r}$. Let k be the order of A. Set $y = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} A^j x$. By convexity of $B(0,r)$, y is in $B(0,r)$, and so $y \in S_{A,0,r}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(x,y) &= \|\frac{1}{k}\sum(A^j x - x)\| \\
&\leqq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}\|A^i x - A^{i+1}x\| \\
&\leqq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j\varepsilon \\
&\leqq \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.7. *Let m be a positive integer and r be a positive real number. We have $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mu(S_{A,\varepsilon,r}) = 0$ uniformly for all $A \in O(d) \setminus \{e\}$ such that the order of A is less than m.*

Proof. For each such A there is a $d-1$ dimensional vector subspace V_A of $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $S_{A,0,r} \subset V_A \cap B(0,r)$, and so $S_{A,\varepsilon,r} \subset (V_A \cap B(0,r)) + B(0, \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon)$. For any $d-1$ dimensional vector subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^d$, the limit $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mu((V \cap B(0,r)) + B(0, \frac{m}{2}\varepsilon))$ converges uniformly to 0. □

Proof of Lemma 4.4. If ε is small enough, for any $A \in \mathrm{O}(d)\setminus\{e\}$ of which order is less than m, $m\mu(S_{A,\varepsilon,r}) < \mu(B(0,r)^\circ \setminus B(0,s))$. This implies that $B(0,r)^\circ \setminus B(0,s)$ is not included in $\bigcup_{A\in G, A\neq e} S_{A,\varepsilon,r}$ for any $G \in \mathfrak{G}$. To take each y_G, we enumerate $\mathfrak{G}$ as $\mathfrak{G} = \{G_1, G_2, \ldots\}$. First take $y_{G_1} \in B(0,r)^\circ \setminus (B(0,s) \cup \bigcup_{A\in G_1, A\neq e} S_{A,\varepsilon,r})$. If we have taken $y_{G_1}, y_{G_2}, \ldots, y_{G_{n-1}}$, we can take $y_{G_n} \in B(0,r)^\circ \setminus (B(0,s) \cup \bigcup_{A\in G_n, A\neq e} S_{A,\varepsilon,r})$ such that $\|y_{G_n}\| \neq \|y_{G_j}\|$ for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. In this way, we can take $y_{G_1}, y_{G_2}, \ldots$ with the desired condition. □

We defined e_i in Notation 1.1.

Lemma 4.8. *For any $r > 0$ there is a subset $F \subset B(0,r)$ such that*

- $1 < \operatorname{card} F < \infty$, *and*
- $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma F = \{e\}$.

Proof. Take for each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$ a positive number $r_j > 0$. Set $F = \{0, r_1 e_1, r_2 e_2, \ldots, r_d e_d\}$. If any two r_j's are different but all close to 1, then 0 is the only vector in F such that the distances with any other vectors are close to 1. Thus if $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\gamma F = F$, then $\gamma 0 = 0$. Since r_j's are all different,$\gamma r_j e_j = r_j e_j$ for each j, and since $\{r_1 e_1, \ldots, r_d e_d\}$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}^d$, γ must be e. □

Lemma 4.9. *For any $r > 0$ and $R > 0$ there are $R' > 0$ and $C_1 > 0$ such that, if $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and D is a Delone set of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is relatively dense with respect to R and uniformly discrete with respect to r, then*

$$\operatorname{card}(\mathrm{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} D \cap B(x, R')) < C_1. \tag{16}$$

Proof. Take $R' > 0$ large enough so that if $e'_1, e'_2, \ldots, e'_d \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\|e_j - e'_j\| < \frac{R}{R'-R}$ for each j, then $\{e'_1, e'_2, \ldots, e'_d\}$ is linear independent. Set $C_1 > k!$, where k is an integer such that $k > \frac{\mu(B(0,R'+r))}{\mu(B(0,\frac{r}{2}))}$.

Take (R,r)-Delone set D and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ arbitrarily. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, d$, there is $x_j \in D \cap B(x + (R'-R)e_j, R)$. Then for each j we have $\|\frac{1}{R'-R}(x_j - x) - e_j\| < \frac{R}{R'-R}$ and so the set of vectors $\{x_j - x \mid j = 1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ is a basis for $\mathbb{R}^d$.

If $\gamma \in \Gamma_x$ and $g(y) = y$ for each $y \in D \cap B(x, R')$, then since γ fixes $x, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d$, $\gamma = e$. Thus we have an embedding of $\mathrm{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} D \cap B(x, R')$ into the permutation group of the set $D \cap B(x, R')$. Since for any two distinct $y, z \in D \cap B(x, R')$ we have $B(y, r/2) \cap B(z, r/2) = \emptyset$, we see $\mu(B(0, r/2)) \operatorname{card} D \cap B(x, R') \leqq \mu(B(0, R' + r))$. The order of the permutation group is less than C_1 which we take above. We thus see the inequality (16). □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Let $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi_1$ be an abstract pattern that consists of bounded components (Definition 2.18). Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is Delone-deriving, that is, there is a Delone set D in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} D$.

Lemma 4.10. *There exists $R_0 > 0$ such that (D, R_0) decomposes $\mathcal{P}$ (Definition 3.29).*

Proof. The set D is Delone so that it is relatively dense for a positive $R_D > 0$ and uniformly discrete for $r_D > 0$. For these R_D and r_D, there are R' and C_1 as in Lemma 4.9. The abstract pattern $\mathcal{P}$ consists of bounded components so that there is $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ as in Definition 2.18. Since D is locally derivable from $\mathcal{P}$, there is a constant $R_{LD} > 0$ for a point $x_0 = y_0 = 0$ as in 1. of Lemme 3.15. Take $R_0 > R_D + R_{\mathcal{P}} + R_{LD} + R'$.

The first condition of Definition 3.29 is satisfied by the assumption.

The Second Condition of Definition 3.29. First, we show $\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0) \mid x \in D\}$ is locally finite and pairwise compatible. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r > 0$, we have an inclusion

$$\{y \in D \mid B(y, R_0) \cap B(x, r) \neq \emptyset\} \subset D \cap B(x, R_0 + r)$$

and the latter is finite. Hence $\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(y, R_0) \cap B(x, r) \mid y \in D\}$ is finite, since it is a zero element except for finitely many $y's$ and by Lemma 2.41, zero element is unique. On the other hand, pairwise-compatibility is clear since for each $\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)$, $\mathcal{P}$ is a majorant.

Since Π_1 is glueable, there is the supremum $\mathcal{Q} = \bigvee\{\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0) \mid x \in D\}$. On one hand, we see by Lemma 2.23 $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \overline{\bigcup_{x \in D} \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0))} \subset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}$; on the other hand, if $y \in \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P}$, then

$$y \in \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap B(y, R_{\mathcal{P}})) \subset \operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)) \subset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$$

for some $x \in D$, and so $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} \subset \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$; we see $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q}$. Since $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)$ for each $x \in D$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is the supremum of such abstract patterns, we have $\mathcal{P} \geqq \mathcal{Q}$. Thus $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cap \operatorname{supp} \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}$ by the definition of order $\geqq$ (Definition 2.19).

The Third Condition of Definition 3.29. For each $x \in D$, take $\gamma \in \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)$. Then

$$(\gamma\mathcal{P}) \cap B(x, R_0) = \gamma(\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)) = \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0),$$

and since $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} D$ with respect to the constant R_{LD}, we have

$$\gamma(D \cap B(x, R')) = (\gamma D) \cap B(x, R') = D \cap B(x, R').$$

This means that $\gamma \in \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} D \cap B(x, R')$. By definition of C_1, $\operatorname{card} \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} \mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0) \leqq \operatorname{card} \operatorname{Sym}_{\Gamma_x} D \cap B(x, R') < C_1$. □

By Lemma 4.10, there is $R_0 > 0$ such that (D, R_0) decomposes $\mathcal{P}$.

By Lemma 3.31, there is a set Λ and a tuple of ingredients $(\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$. Let $(C_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be the recipe for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to $(D, R_0, (\mathcal{P}_\lambda)_\lambda)$. Then we have the following:

- Λ is a set which is at most countable.
- Since each $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ is a copy of an abstract pattern of the form $\mathcal{P} \cap B(x, R_0)$ $(x \in D)$ by an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma x = 0$, by Definition 3.29 we have the following: $G_\lambda = \mathrm{Sym}_{\Gamma_0} \mathcal{P}_\lambda$ is a finite group, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and $\max_\lambda \operatorname{card} G_\lambda < \infty$.
- For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, C_λ is a subset of Γ such that

$$C_\lambda G_\lambda = C_\lambda. \tag{17}$$

- D is a Delone set such that

$$D = \{\gamma 0 \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \gamma \in C_\lambda\}. \tag{18}$$

- There is $r_0 > 0$ such that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{if } \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda, \gamma \in C_\lambda,\ \eta \in C_\mu \text{ and } \rho(\gamma 0, \eta 0) \leqq 4r_0, \text{ then } \gamma 0 = \eta 0, \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{and so } \lambda = \mu \text{ and } \gamma^{-1}\eta \in G_\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By Proposition 3.36, we have $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} (C_\lambda)_\lambda$. To prove $\mathcal{S} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{P}$ for some $\mathcal{S} \in \Sigma$, we construct an abstract pattern $\mathcal{S}$ in Σ such that $\mathcal{S} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} (C_\lambda)_\lambda$. It consists of three steps.

Step 1: construction of $\mathcal{E}$.

By Lemma 4.4, there are $y_\lambda \in B(0, \frac{3}{4}r_0) \setminus B(0, \frac{1}{2}r_0)$ for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $r_1 \in (0, \frac{1}{8}r_0)$ such that

- $\inf\{\rho(\gamma y_\lambda, y_\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \gamma \in G_\lambda \setminus \{e\}\} > 4r_1 > 0$, and
- if λ, μ are two distinct elements of Λ, then we have $\rho(0, y_\lambda) \neq \rho(0, y_\mu)$.

By Lemma 4.8, there are $F \subset B(0, \frac{1}{2}r_1)$ and $r_2 \in (0, \frac{1}{4}r_1)$ such that

- If $x, y \in F$ and $x \neq y$, then $\rho(x, y) > 4r_2$,
- $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma F = \{e\}$, and
- $\infty > \operatorname{card} F > 1$.

Take $\gamma_x \in \Gamma$, for each $x \in X$, such that $\gamma_x 0 = x$.

Definition 4.11. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a symmetric building block of Σ for $(0, r_2)$. (Its existence is assumed in Setting 5.) Set $\mathcal{E} = \bigvee\{\gamma_x \mathcal{P} \mid x \in F\}$.

Remark 4.12. Since points of F are separated by the distance $4r_2$, by the definition of building block the set $\{\gamma_x \mathcal{P} \mid x \in F\}$ is pairwise compatible. Since it is a finite set, it is locally finite. Its supremum exists.

Lemma 4.13. $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{E} = \{e\}$.

Proof. Take $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}$. Since $\gamma\mathcal{E} = \bigvee\{\gamma\gamma_x\mathcal{P} \mid x \in F\}$, by Lemma 3.43, for each $x \in F$ there is $y \in F$ such that $\gamma\gamma_x\mathcal{P} = \gamma_y\mathcal{P}$. By the definition of building block (Definition 3.38), we have $\gamma\gamma_x 0 = \gamma_y 0$ and $\gamma x = y$. This implies that $\gamma F \subset F$ and $\gamma F = F$, which implies that $\gamma = e$. □

Lemma 4.14. *The set $\{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{E}\}$ is a family of building blocks of Σ for $(0, r_1)$.*

Proof. We apply Lemma 3.41. The sets $\{e\}$ and $\{\gamma_x \mid x \in F\}$ play the role of admissible digits. If $x \in F$, then

$$\rho(\gamma_x 0, 0) = \rho(x, 0) \leqq \frac{1}{2} r_1 < r_1 - 2r_2,$$

and so by Lemma 3.41 the first two axioms for family of building blocks are satisfied.

Since $\mathcal{P}$ is a building block, we have $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{P} \subset \Gamma_0$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{E} = \{e\} \subset \Gamma_0$. Finally, we never have $\gamma\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{E}$ for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$. If this holds we have, by Lemma 3.43, $\gamma_x\mathcal{P} = \gamma\mathcal{P}$ for any $x \in F$, and this implies $x = \gamma_x 0 = \gamma 0$ for each $x \in F$. This contradicts the fact that $\operatorname{card} F > 1$. □

Step2: construction of $\mathcal{R}_\lambda$.

For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, set

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \bigvee\{\mathcal{P}\} \cup \{\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E} \mid \gamma \in G_\lambda\}.$$

Lemma 4.15. *The set $\{\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a family of building blocks for $(0, r_0)$.*

Proof. Since $\gamma 0 = 0$, we have for each $\gamma \in G_\lambda$,

$$\rho(\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda} 0, 0) = \rho(0, y_\lambda) > \frac{1}{2} r_0 > 4r_1,$$

and by definition of y_λ's, for each distinct $\gamma, \eta \in G_\lambda$,

$$\rho(\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda} 0, \eta\gamma_{y_\lambda} 0) = \rho(\eta^{-1}\gamma y_\lambda, y_\lambda) > 4r_1$$

we see the pair of $\{e\}$ and $\{\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda} \mid \gamma \in G_\lambda\}$ forms an admissible digit for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Moreover,

$$\rho(\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda} 0, 0) = \rho(0, y_\lambda) \leqq \frac{3}{4} r_0 < r_0 - 2r_1$$

we see, by Lemma 3.41, the first two axioms for the building block are satisfied.

Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ and $\gamma_0\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \mathcal{R}_\mu$. By Lemma 3.43, we have $\gamma_0\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$ and so $\gamma_0 0 = 0$. Again by Lemma 3.43, there is $\gamma \in G_\mu$ such that $\gamma_0\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E} = \gamma\gamma_{y_\mu}\mathcal{E}$, and so by Lemma 4.13, $\gamma_0\gamma_{y_\lambda} = \gamma\gamma_{y_\mu}$. This implies that (since γ_0 and γ fix 0)

$$\rho(0, y_\lambda) = \rho(0, \gamma_0\gamma_{y_\lambda} 0) = \rho(0, \gamma\gamma_{y_\mu} 0) = \rho(0, y_\mu)$$

and so $\lambda = \mu$. □

Lemma 4.16. $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{R}_\lambda = G_\lambda$ *for each* λ.

Proof. Take $\gamma_0 \in \mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{R}_\lambda$. By Lemma 3.43, there is $\gamma \in G_\lambda$ such that $\gamma_0\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E} = \gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E}$ and so by Lemma 4.13 we have $\gamma_0 = \gamma \in G_\lambda$.

On the other hand, if $\gamma_0 \in G_\lambda$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_0\mathcal{R}_\lambda =& \bigvee\{\gamma_0\mathcal{P}\} \cup \{\gamma_0\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E} \mid \gamma \in G_\lambda\}\\ =& \bigvee\{\mathcal{P}\} \cup \{\gamma\gamma_{y_\lambda}\mathcal{E} \mid \gamma \in G_\lambda\}\\ =& \mathcal{R}_\lambda,\end{aligned}$$

since $\mathcal{P}$ is a symmetric building block. □

Step3: Construction of $\mathcal{S}$ and its property.

Define

$$\mathcal{S} = \bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \gamma \in C_\lambda\}.$$

by (19), $(C_\lambda)_\lambda$ is an admissible digit for $(\mathcal{R}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ and so $\mathcal{S}$ is well-defined.

Lemma 4.17. $\mathcal{S} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\Rightarrow} D$.

Proof. Let R be an arbitrary positive real number. Set $L = R + 3r_0$. Assume $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and

$$(\gamma\mathcal{S}) \cap B(0, L) = (\eta\mathcal{S}) \cap B(0, L). \tag{20}$$

Set $\Xi = \{\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \xi \in C_\lambda\}$, then by (20) and Lemma 3.14, we see

$$\bigvee(\gamma\Xi \cap B(0, L)) = \bigvee(\eta\Xi \cap B(0, L)).$$

Consider the following two finite sets:

$$F_1 = \{\gamma\xi 0 \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \xi \in C_\lambda, \gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda \cap B(0, L) \neq 0\}$$

and

$$F_2 = \{\eta\zeta 0 \mid \lambda \in \Lambda, \zeta \in C_\lambda, \eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\lambda \cap B(0, L) \neq 0\}.$$

For each $x = \gamma\xi 0 \in F_1$, we consider an abstract pattern $\mathcal{P}^1_x = \gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda \cap B(0, L)$. This is included in $B(\gamma\xi 0, r_0)$. For F_2 we define $\mathcal{P}^2_x$'s in a similar way. We can apply Lemma 2.25 and obtain the following: if $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $\xi \in C_\lambda$ and $\gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda \cap B(0, L) \neq 0$, there is $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $\zeta \in C_\mu$ such that

$$(\gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda) \cap B(0, L) = (\eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\mu) \cap B(0, L).$$

Now we prove $(\gamma D)\cap B(0,R) \subset (\eta D)\cap B(0,R)$. Take an element $\gamma\xi 0$ from the left-hand side set, where $\xi \in C_\lambda$ for some λ and $\gamma\xi 0 \in B(0,R)$. Then $\operatorname{supp}\gamma\xi R_\lambda \subset B(0, R+r_0)$. As in the previous paragraph, there are $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $\zeta \in C_\mu$ such that $\gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda = (\eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\mu)\cap B(0,L)$. The support of this abstract pattern is included in $B(0,R+r_0)$ and the support of $\eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\mu$ has a diameter less than $2r_0$; we have $\operatorname{supp}(\eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\mu) \subset B(0,L)$ and so $\gamma\xi\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \eta\zeta\mathcal{R}_\mu$. Since $(\mathcal{R}_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a family of building blocks, we see $\lambda = \mu$ and $\gamma\xi 0 = \eta\zeta 0 \in \eta D$. We have proved $(\gamma D)\cap B(0,R) \subset (\eta D)\cap B(0,R)$ and by symmetry the reverse inclusion is true. □

Lemma 4.18. *For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in C_\lambda$, we have*

$$\mathcal{S}\cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) = \gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda.$$

Proof. If $\mu \in \Lambda$, $\eta \in C_\mu$ and $\eta\mathcal{R}_\mu \cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) \neq 0$, then $\rho(\gamma 0, \eta 0) \leqq 2r_0$ and so by (19), $\lambda = \mu$ and $\gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda = \eta\mathcal{R}_\mu$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}\cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) &= \bigvee\{\eta\mathcal{R}_\mu \cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) \mid \mu \in \Lambda, \eta \in C_\mu\}\\ &= \bigvee\{\gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda \cap B(\gamma 0, r_0)\}\\ &= \gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.19. *The pair (D, r_0) decomposes $\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Clear by the definition of $\mathcal{S}$, Lemma 4.18 and Lemma 4.17 and Lemma 4.16. □

Lemma 4.20. *$(\mathcal{R}_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to (D, r_0) and (C_λ) is the recipe for $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to $(D, r_0, (\mathcal{R}_\lambda)_{\lambda\in\Lambda})$.*

Proof. Take $x \in D$ arbitrarily. By (18), there are $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in C_\lambda$ such that $x = \gamma 0$ and by Lemma 4.18, $\mathcal{S}\cap B(x, r_0) = \mathcal{S}\cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) = \gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda$. The uniqueness of such λ is clear since $(\mathcal{R}_\mu)_{\mu\in\Lambda}$ is a family of building blocks. We have shown that $(\mathcal{R}_\mu)$ is a tuple of ingredients for $\mathcal{P}$ with respect to (D, r_0).

Next we show that $(C_\lambda)_\lambda$ is the recipe. If $\mu \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in C_\mu$, then $\gamma 0 \in D$ by (18) and $\mathcal{S}\cap B(\gamma 0, r_0) = \gamma\mathcal{R}_\mu$ by Lemma 4.18, and so $\gamma \in \Gamma_\mu(\mathcal{S}, D, r_0, (\mathcal{R}_\lambda))$. Conversely, if $\gamma \in \Gamma_\mu(\mathcal{S}, D, r_0, (\mathcal{R}_\lambda))$, then $\gamma 0 \in D$ and $\gamma\mathcal{R}_\mu = \mathcal{S}\cap B(\gamma 0, r_0)$. By (18), there is $\nu \in \Lambda$ and $\eta \in C_\nu$ such that $\gamma 0 = \eta 0$, and so by Lemma 4.18, $\eta\mathcal{R}_\nu = \mathcal{S}\cap B(\eta 0, r_0)$. This implies that $\gamma\mathcal{R}_\mu = \eta\mathcal{R}_\nu$, and so $\mu = \nu$ and $\eta^{-1}\gamma \in \operatorname{Sym}_\Gamma \mathcal{R}_\mu = G_\mu$. By (17), we see $\gamma = \eta\eta^{-1}\gamma \in C_\mu G_\mu = C_\mu$. We have proved $C_\mu = \Gamma_\mu(\mathcal{S}, D, r_0, (\mathcal{R}_\lambda))$ for any $\mu \in \Lambda$. □

Theorem 4.21. $\mathcal{S} \overset{\text{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} (C_\lambda)_\lambda$.

Proof. Clear from Lemma 4.20 and Proposition 3.36. □

Corollary 4.22. $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.36, $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} (C_\lambda)$ because (C_λ) is a recipe for $\mathcal{P}$. Combined with Theorem 4.21 we have $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{S}$. □

Lemma 4.23. $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{S}$ *is relatively dense.*

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there is $y \in D$ near x. By (18), there are $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in C_\lambda$ such that $y = \gamma 0$. Since $\operatorname{supp}\gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda \subset B(y, r_0)$, any point in $\operatorname{supp}\gamma\mathcal{R}_\lambda$, which is a point in $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{S}$, is near x. □

This lemma completes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

5 An application of Theorem 4.1

In this section we apply Theorem 4.1 to the theory of pattern-equivariant functions.

We start with a definition in an abstract setting:

Definition 5.1. Let Π be a pattern space over (X, Γ) and Π' a pattern space over (Y, Γ), where Γ is a group which acts on metric spaces X and Y respectively as isometries. Let Σ be a subshift of Π'. For each $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$, we set

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}} = \{\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma \mid \mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

In order to study the relations between $\mathcal{P}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$, the maximal elements of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$, that is, the elements $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma$ such that $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{Q}$, are useful. It may be that there is no maximal elements, but Theorem 4.1 gives us a sufficient condition for $\mathcal{P}$ and Σ to admit maximal elements. In the following theorem, using maximal elements, we show $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$ has all of the information on $\mathcal{P}$ up to MLD:

Theorem 5.2. *Let Γ be a closed subgroup of $E(d)$ that contains $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let Π, Π', Π'' be glueable pattern spaces over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$ and Σ a glueable subshift of Π'' which has sufficiently many symmetric building blocks. Take $\mathcal{P} \in \Pi$ and $\mathcal{P}' \in \Pi'$ and assume that they consist of bounded components and they are Delone-deriving (Definition 3.19). Then we have $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{P}'$ if and only if $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}} = \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{P}'$, then for any $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$ we have $\mathcal{P}' \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{Q}$, and so $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'}$. The converse also holds and so $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'} = \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'}$.

Suppose $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}} = \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'}$. By Theorem 4.1 there is $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{Q}$ (that is, $\mathcal{Q}$ is a maximal element). Since $\mathcal{Q} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{P}'}$, we have $\mathcal{P}' \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{Q}$ and so $\mathcal{P}' \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}$. Similarly $\mathcal{P} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} \mathcal{P}'$. □

Thus under the assumption of Theorem 5.2, in order to analyze $\mathcal{P}$ up to MLD it suffices to investigate $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$.

Next, we move on to the theory of pattern equivariant functions. We will show for certain Σ consisting of functions, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the space of pattern equivariant functions. First, we recall the definition of pattern equivariant functions. Kellendonk [6] defined pattern-equivariant functions for tilings or Delone sets in order to study cohomology of the tiling spaces. Rand [7] generalized the definition to incorporate rotations and flips in the 2-dimensional cases. We recall the definitions here.

Definition 5.3. Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and C be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Set

$$\mathcal{T} \sqcap C = \{T \in \mathcal{T} \mid \overline{T} \cap S \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Kellendonk gave a definition for subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, but here we define pattern-equivariant functions for tilings ([5]).

Definition 5.4 ([6],[5])**.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and X be a set. A function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to X$ is said to be $\mathcal{T}$-equivariant if there is $R > 0$ such that $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $(\mathcal{T} - x) \sqcap B(0, R) = (\mathcal{T} - y) \sqcap B(0, R)$ imply $f(x) = f(y)$.

Definition 5.5 ([7])**.** Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$, Γ a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{E}(d)$ that contains $\mathbb{R}^d$, G an abelian group and $\phi\colon \Gamma_0 \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ a group homomorphism. Here, $\mathrm{Aut}(G)$ is the group of automorphisms of G. We say a function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to G$ is $\mathcal{T}$-equivariant with representation ϕ, or is ϕ-invariant, if there is $R > 0$ such that $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$ and

$$(\mathcal{T} \sqcap B(x', R)) - x' = \gamma(\mathcal{T} \sqcap B(x, R) - x)$$

imply $f(x') = \phi(\gamma)(f(x))$.

We show these pattern equivariant functions are captured in terms of local derivability in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tiling which consists of bounded components. In other words, the diameter of tiles in $\mathcal{T}$ is bounded from above. Then for any $f \in \mathrm{Map}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C})$, f is $\mathcal{T}$-equivariant if and only if $\mathcal{T} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} f$. Here we regard $\mathcal{T}$ as an element of $\mathrm{Patch}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (Example 3.7), which is a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$, and f as an element of $\mathrm{Map}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}, 0)$ (Example 3.9), which is a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{R}^d)$.*

For what follows let $\pi\colon \Gamma \ni (a, A) \mapsto A \in \Gamma_0$ be the projection.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a tiling which consists of bounded components. Let Γ be a closed subgroup of $E(d)$ that contains $\mathbb{R}^d$, G an abelian group and $\phi\colon \Gamma_0 \to \mathrm{Aut}(G)$ a group homomorphism. Then for any $f \in \mathrm{Map}(\mathbb{R}^d, G)$, f is $\mathcal{T}$-equivariant with representation ϕ if and only if $\mathcal{T} \overset{\mathrm{LD}}{\to} f$. Here $\mathcal{T}$ is regarded as an element of $\mathrm{Patch}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (Example 3.7), which is a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$, and f is regarded as an element of $\mathrm{Map}_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, G, e)$ (Example 3.9), which is a pattern space over $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$.*

These two lemmas show that pattern equivariant functions are just functions which are locally derivable from the tiling. Thus in the case where $\mathcal{T}$ is a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^d$ that consists of bounded components and Σ is a certain subshift consisting of functions, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$ (Definition 5.1) is just the space of all $\mathcal{T}$-equivariant functions (either in the sense of Definition 5.4 or of Definition 5.5).

We apply Theorem 5.2 to this situation where Σ is a space of functions and obtain an insight on pattern equivariant functions. We will show that the space of smooth pattern equivariant functions, with their ranges in $\mathbb{C}^m$, remembers the original abstract pattern up to MLD (Theorem 5.10).

Here is the setting: let Γ be a closed subgroup of $\mathrm{E}(d)$ that contains $\mathbb{R}^d$. Take a group homomorphism $\phi\colon \Gamma_0 \to GL_m(\mathbb{C})$. Let $C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ be the subshift of $\mathrm{Map}_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ consisting of all smooth elements of $\mathrm{Map}_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$. (We say a map $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}^m$ is smooth if $\langle f(\cdot), v\rangle$ is smooth for any $v \in \mathbb{C}^m$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the standard inner product.) In order to use Theorem 5.2 to $\Sigma = C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, G, 0)$, we need to show Σ admits sufficiently many symmetric building blocks. We show in two cases there are sufficiently many building blocks (Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.9.)

Lemma 5.8. *Suppose there is $v \in \mathbb{C}^m \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\phi(\gamma)v = v$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$. Then $C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ has sufficiently many symmetric building blocks: in other words, for any $r > 0$ there is a symmetric building block g_r for $(0, r)$.*

Proof. For each $r > 0$, set

$$f_r(x) = \begin{cases} \exp(-\frac{1}{r^2 - \|x\|^2}) & \text{if } \|x\| < r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then f_r is a smooth real-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Set $g_r(x) = f_r(x)v$.Then $\emptyset \neq \operatorname{supp} g_r \subset B(0, r)$. Moreover, if $\gamma, \eta \in \Gamma$ and $\rho(\gamma 0, \eta 0) > 4r$, then γg_r and ηg_r are compatible since

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \gamma g_r(x) & \text{if } x \in B(\gamma 0, r) \\ \eta g_r(x) & \text{if } x \in B(\eta 0, r) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is a majorant. Finally $\mathrm{Sym}_\Gamma\, g_r = \Gamma_0$. □

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose Γ_0 is finite. Then $C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ has sufficiently many building blocks.*

Proof. For any $r > 0$, take $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $r_1 \in (0, r/4)$ such that $\|x\| < r/2$ and if $A \in \Gamma_0$ and $A \neq I$, then $\|Ax - x\| > 4r_1$. Take $v \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and set $f(x) = f_{r_1}(x)v$ (we defined f_{r_1} in the proof of Lemma 5.8.) Set $h = \bigvee\{(A, Ax)f \mid A \in \Gamma_0\}$. Then h is a symmetric building block. □

By Lemma 5.8, Lemma 5.9 and Theorem 5.2, we have the following:

Theorem 5.10. *Assume the same assumption as in Lemma 5.8 or in Lemma 5.9. Let* Π *and* Π' *be glueable pattern spaces over* $(\mathbb{R}^d, \Gamma)$ *and take* $\mathcal{P}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}'$ *from* Π *and* Π' *respectively. Assume* $\mathcal{P}$ *and* $\mathcal{P}'$ *are both Delone-deriving and consist of bounded components. Set* $\Sigma = C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$. *Then* $\mathcal{P} \overset{\text{MLD}}{\leftrightarrow} \mathcal{Q}$ *if and only if* $\Sigma_\mathcal{P} = \Sigma_\mathcal{Q}$.

Thus in order to study Delone deriving abstract patterns which consist of bounded components up to MLD, it suffices to study the space $\Sigma_\mathcal{P}$ (where $\Sigma = C^\infty_{\phi\circ\pi}(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathbb{C}^m, 0)$) of smooth pattern-equivariant functions. We may regard the space $\Sigma_\mathcal{P}$ as the space of functions that reflect the structure of $\mathcal{P}$. Sometimes in mathematics the set of functions that reflect the structure of an object remembers the original object. For example, consider a locally compact abelian group and its dual, or a smooth manifold M and its space $C^\infty(M)$ of smooth functions. Theorem 5.10 is similar to such phenomena.

Acknowledgment

I thank Takeshi Katsura for giving me comments for the draft of this article.

References

[1] Michael Baake and Uwe Grimm, *Aperiodic order*, vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, 2013.

[2] Michael Baake and Robert V. Moody, *Weighted Dirac combs with pure point diffraction*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **573** (2004), 61–94. MR 2084582

[3] Michael Baake, M Scholottmann, and Peter D Jarvis, *Quasiperiodic tilings with tenfold symmetry and equivalence with respect to local derivability*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **24** (1991), no. 19, 4637.

[4] Jean-Baptiste Gouéré, *Quasicrystals and almost periodicity*, Comm. Math. Phys. **255** (2005), no. 3, 655–681. MR 2135448 (2006j:52026)

[5] William Patrick Kalahurka, *Rotational cohomology and total pattern equivariant cohomology of tiling spaces acted on by infinite groups*, Ph.D. thesis, 2010.

[6] Johannes Kellendonk, *Pattern-equivariant functions and cohomology*, J. Phys. A **36** (2003), no. 21, 5765–5772. MR 1985494 (2004e:52025)

[7] Betseygail Rand, *Pattern-equivariant cohomology of tiling spaces with rotations*, Ph.D. thesis, 2006.

[8] John Ratcliffe, *Foundations of hyperbolic manifolds*, vol. 149, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[9] Lorenzo Sadun, *Topology of tiling spaces*, University Lecture Series, vol. 46, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. MR 2446623 (2009m:52041)

[10] Boris Solomyak, *Spectrum of dynamical systems arising from delone sets*, Quasicrystals and Discrete Geometry, ed. J. Patera, Fields Institute Monographs **10** (1998), 265–275.

[11] Nicolae Strungaru, *Almost periodic measures and meyer sets*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.00945 (2015).